NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXX.

SEPTEMBER, 1892.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE QUEEN.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

TO HER MAJESTY, THE QUEEN:

MADAM: From the death-bed of him who made two continents one with fire from Heaven, I bear a message praying Your Majesty's mediation in the cause of international friendship.

When he stood in his strong prime who has this day fallen on sleep—that immortal whom your own immortal, John Bright, named "the Columbus of modern times who, by his cable, had moored the new world alongside of the old"—behind him and beside him stood another strong and silent man, with hand and heart and purse helping in the work.

Now the child and the grandchild of that silent partner are in the sorest straits that ever befell woman—strangers in a strange land,—one immured in a prison for life, the other, with the wonderful persistence of a mother's exquisite agony, vainly struggling to open those prison doors. The watchers by the dying pillow, in their own consecrated sorrow, remember the thousandfold greater sorrow of the widow and orphan; and in their behalf, for their behoof, I receive and remit to you this reminder of international courtesy, hoping that it may revive the tender grace of a day that is dead.

In our late troublous time, to which you, Madam, conjointly with your best beloved dead, lent an olive branch of peace and friendly consideration that won our everlasting gratitude—on the

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

15th of March, 1863—the schooner "J. M. Chapman" was seized in the harbor of San Francisco by the United States revenue officers, while sailing, or about to sail, on a cruise against the commerce of the United States. The case came for trial at the October term, 1863. The testimony showed that Alfred Rubery, a native of England, and owners, had, under pretext of acting in the interest of Mexico, purchased a ship, arms, ammunition, brass cannon, shells, fuse, powder, muskets, lead, caps, knives, and uniforms, for the purpose of taking mail steamships and other vessels plying between San Francisco and Panama. They had made a voyage to Cerros Island for the purpose of examining into its fitness as a depot and rendezvous whence to attack Panama steamers. They had shipped a large quantity of lumber with which to construct berths, a prison room, and a lower deck. Their plans and route were prepared in detail, a false manifesto was sworn to, fifteen men were smuggled in among the cargo, and they had already cast off the lines and begun working the schooner out from the wharf when they were boarded and seized by the United States.

Of their guilt was no doubt. The revenue officers had been aware of the intended enterprise and had kept a constant watch on the vessel night and day. They had noted all the movements. Papers torn, chewed, and partially burned were found strewed about the hold, and two sailors, who had been confined over night to prevent them from leaving the vessel, testified that some of the party had employed the time intervening between the boarding of the vessel and the opening of the hatchway in destroying papers. Loaded pistols and bowie knives were found stowed away in the interstices between the packages and the cargo. In Rubery's baggage were found a proclamation to the people of California to throw off the authority of the people of the United States, and a plan for the capture of the United States forts at San Francisco, and the form of an oath of fidelity to the cause, which Rubery admitted that he had spent some time in preparing.

The evidence was complete and overpowering. The case was tried before the Circuit Court of the Northern District of California over which Mr. Justice Field, brother of Cyrus Field, was then presiding. "In a calm spirit of judicial inquiry and unaffected by the excitements of the hour or the fierce passions nec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essarily aroused by the stupendous contest in which the country was engaged," Judge Field laid down his argument on the lines prescribed by Judge Story, that "the most sacred right of every party accused of crime is that the jury should respond as to the facts and the court as to the law."

The jury responded to proven and indeed undenied facts with a verdict of guilty, and Rubery was sentenced to a fine and to ten years' imprisonment—a light penalty for so heavy a crime.

Soon afterwards, when Judge Field had taken his seat on the bench of the Supreme Court in Washington, John Bright sent a letter asking for the pardon of this English convict. Judge Field doubted and might well doubt whether President Lincoln would grant such a pardon or ought to grant it. Judge Field was a Californian and he knew how deeply and justly incensed were the people of San Francisco at the plot of an Englishman, which threatened millions of treasure and hundreds of lives, and he found they might hotly resent any interference with the cause of justice.

But he went to the President with John Bright's letter and his own representations and the pardon was promptly granted. In Vol. IV. of the Law Reports, following the report of the case, it is duly recorded: "The pardon of Rubery was granted as a mark of respect and good will to Mr. Bright by whom it had been solicited."

In the year of our Lord 1889 an American stood at the bar of an English court—a woman, frightened, shrinking, fainting—and heard her terrible verdict of guilt and her terrible doom of death. She was but twenty-six years of age. By long expatriation she had become a stranger in her own land, but she was of a family eminent in many branches, in military and civil service, in law, literature and theology. All her American associations and connections are of refinement, of culture, of virtue.

The verdict and the sentence were so opposed to the expectations raised by the evidence that the Secretary of State for the Home Department was forced by the popular revolt to review the case, and by this review to quash the indictment for murder, to reverse the verdict of guilty of murder, and to remit the penalty of death.

But the prisoner was not released. She remains to this day enduring the rigorous penalty of imprisonment for life.

Her wide circle of relatives in America petitioned through the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regular channels for her release, but without effect. By the unwearying devotion of her most accomplished and most unhappy mother her case was brought to the notice of Mrs. Harrison, the wife of the President of the United States,—a woman who was never known to turn away from any good cause, and whose warm, motherly heart was touched by the sorrow of this *mater dolorosa*. She heard the sighing of the prisoner, and at once sent to you, Madam, this petition for her relief.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, Aug. 7, 1891.

To Her Majesty, the Queen:

MADAM: The four and fifty years of your illustrious reign have estabtablished you in the respect and love of the citizens of this Republic.

Confiding in the power of your Majesty and in the power of your goodness, we pray your grace in behalf of our young countrywoman, Florence Maybrick, a widow, a mother, fatherless, brotherless, wearing out in prison a life sentence of penal servitude upon the charge of murdering her husband by arsenical poisoning.

The beneficent law of England, which has become so largely the basis of personal rights in our own country, requires that the proof of guilt should remove every reasonable doubt, and it is understood here that the Secretary of State for the Home Department of the English Government, upon a review of the evidence in Mrs. Maybrick's case, concluded that there was a reasonable doubt whether Mr. Maybrick died of arsenical poisoning, and upon this ground commuted the sentence of death to imprisonment for life. There seems to be the very highest medical and scientific authority in support of the proposition that Mr. Maybrick's symptoms were not compatible with arsenical poisoning. There was, it is understood, an entire absence of proof that Mrs. Maybrick administered or attempted to administer arsenic to her husband with intent to kill; while evidence that Mr. Maybrick had been in the habit of taking arsenic as a medicine was present in the case.

In view of all these facts, we earnestly, respectfully, and trustfully entreat of your most gracious Majesty a pardon and release for Mrs. Maybrick.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) CAROLINE SCOTT HARRISON,
HARRIET STANWOOD BLAINE,
ANNE M. FOSTER,
ELLEN R. RUSK.

To this was added the explanatory note by the Secretary of State:

"The signatures are those of the wife of the President, the wife of the Secretary of State, the wife of the Secretary of the Treasury, the wife of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The other ladies of the cabinet were too widely separated for the summer recess to be reached, while the suffering of the victim cried for the speediest relief.

To this petition the wife of the President of the United States received no response. If any reply were made it must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been considered of a nature to give no pleasure to the exalted lady who had sent the petition and to those who had joined their request to hers. I have heard a rumor that Your Majesty received the petition graciously, but of that we need no assurance. The royal courtesy which has marked your long reign, which has not only endeared you to your subjects, but has made all English-speaking people your subjects by the most divine of rights, and which has been so powerful an influence in preserving the peace of Europe, needs not to be officially attested to us, nor has a hundred years' experience led us to any doubt of the reception which will always be accorded by her peers to the wife of the President of the United States.

On the presumption that this petition might not have been presented to the judgment of Your Majesty, as royal in wisdom as in rank, the attention of your Private Secretary, Sir Henry Ponsonby, was solicited in the following letter:

SIR: The Queen of England is, by her high personal character, Queen of the United States of America as well. When she took the world into her confidence and told us the beautiful romance of her life, the story of her Knight without fear and without reproach, she laid a spell upon the hearts of all women, never to be broken, and made domestic love no less than royal ability the lofty token of her most illustrious reign.

We in America, who

> "Esteem that wedded hand less dear for sceptre than for ring,
> And hold her uncrowned womanhood to be the royal thing,"

watch the Queen evermore with a jealousy born of love, and cannot permit even the shadow of a shadow to rest upon that royal hand which carries the highest standard of the womanhood of the nineteenth century.

Yet the machinery of justice in the Queen's England is persisting in an act of injustice. The machinery of law, in the Queen's name, is holding an innocent young American woman in torture. The Queen, who mourns the loss of her children, and the late loss of her grandson, the heir of England, is made to stand before the world in the attitude of depriving another mother of her only child, of all her grandchildren. Mrs. Maybrick is in Woking Prison for life upon a charge of which she has never been accused, and for which she has never been tried. This cannot be English justice. She was tried for the murder of her husband. The judge charged the jury that it was necessary to an unfavorable verdict that her husband died of arsenic. The Home Secretary, after an exhaustive investigation, found that there is a reasonable doubt whether her husband died of arsenic. Why, then, is she in prison? It cannot be English justice that keeps her there. It is not English law, for it is the essence of English law that one is innocent until he is proven guilty. This young American, widow, daughter, mother, can be buried alive in Woking Prison only on the principle that one is guilty until he is proven innocent.

Even on that principle she is proven innocent so far as a negative can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever be proven. The highest medical authority in Great Britain plainly, even eagerly, testifies that all the symptoms in Mr. Maybrick's case pointed away from arsenic as the cause of death. Not one jot or tittle of evidence has been brought forward that Mrs. Maybrick ever administered or attempted to administer poison to her husband.

While life lasts or her slavery endures, I shall not cease to work for the release of Mrs. Maybrick—whom I have never seen, and of whom I first heard through the agonized entreaties of her mother for the intervention of the State Department. The Secretary of State has moved in the matter through the American Minister. American women have contributed a fund said to be requisite for a further consideration of the case.

It is now in the hands of eminent lawyers in London, and the more it is presented in detail the more incredible appears the violation of law, of justice, of humanity.

If all these resources fail to rescue this woman from her undeserved dungeon, her wrongs will be referred to Congress for international expostulation and redress.

But through all the law's delay, and the delay necessary to the courtesy of nations, the innocent young mother, of gentle birth and breeding, is in a convict cell, deprived of children, of mother, of liberty—far worse than to be deprived of life—wearing her young years away in the desolation of degradation. How glorious the triumph of royal womanhood if, striking across all the mental malady and mistaken zeal which thrust the prisoner into darkness, and the blind loyalty to error once committed which keeps her there, the great Queen and tender mother should rise up even in the grief of her own bereavement and England's loss and out of her own royal justice and discernment—already on many great occasions signally displayed, and never more signally than in America's hour of storm and stress—should give back this hapless and innocent young mother to the light of day and the sunshine of her childrens' faces!

God Save the Queen!

The prompt reply of Sir Henry Ponsonby was only to the effect that the Queen has no power to release a prisoner who has been tried and convicted, and that any application on any prisoner's behalf should be made to the Home Secretary.

The fund referred to in this letter was subscribed by American women and children to ascertain what if any further step could be taken in law for the rescue of their countrywoman, and was paid to the widely-known London solicitors, Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, by whom the sum that would be requisite had been named. They prepared a brief but impressive statement of the most important facts in the case, which they presented to counsel selected by themselves, and composed of such eminent lawyers and members of Parliament as Sir Charles Russell, Mr. J. Fletcher Moulton, Mr. Harry Bodkin Poland and Mr. Reginald J. Smith. Their consultations and deliberations were repeated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and prolonged through five months, but they were obliged to confess at last that the law of England has provided no way of escape for an innocent women doomed to imprisonment for life.

Their "Opinion" is in these words:

Having carefully considered the facts stated in the elaborate case submitted to us by Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, and the law applicable to the matter, we are clearly of the opinion that there is no mode by which in this case a new trial or a *venire de novo* can be obtained, nor can the prisoner be brought up on a *habeas corpus* with a view to retrying the issue of her innocence or guilt.

. . . We are of the opinion that in English criminal procedure there is no possibility of procuring a rehearing in the case of felony where a verdict has been found by a properly constituted jury, upon an indictment which is correct in form. This rule is in our opinion absolute, unless circumstances have transpired, and have been entered upon the record which, when there appearing, would invalidate the tribunal and reduce the trial to a nullity by reason of its not having been before a properly constituted tribunal. None of the matters proposed to be proved go to this length.

We think it right to add that there are many matters stated in the case, not merely with reference to the evidence at, and the incidents of, the trial, but suggesting new facts, which would be matter proper for the grave consideration of a Court of Criminal Appeal if such a tribunal existed in this country.

(Signed), C. Russell, J. Fletcher Moulton, Harry Bodkin Poland, Reginald J. Smith.

Lincoln's Inn, April 12, 1892.

That the prisoner is innocent they were careful to imply in the concluding paragraph of their formal "opinion."

No stronger testimony is needed to the terrible defectiveness of the trial than this guarded statement.

There are *many* matters for appeal:

These matters refer to the *evidence* at the trial—the vital part of every trial:

These matters would be *proper* for the *grave consideration* of a court of appeal.

If there are many vital matters of evidence which need grave reconsideration, can they have been properly and adequately considered at the original trial? Can there be stronger condemnation of the first trial than a decision that the matters which it left improperly and inadequately treated are many and vital?

But the United States has no jurisdiction over England, and cannot create or re-create her laws. The decision of counsel was rendered at too late a day for effective presentation to Congress

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the present session. Recourse therefore was quickly had once more to the universal right of petition. Under the immediate inspection, suggestion, and revision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States a petition was prepared. The Supreme Court has indeed a singular interest in the prisoner, as I learned from themselves. The Chief Justice is connected with Mrs. Maybrick's family on the mother's side by marriage—remotely but nearly enough to have enlisted his close attention to her trial. His opinion I have not the right to give, and would not, lest, even through so unimportant and unofficial a channel, it might seem to be a judicial reflection in one country upon a judicial decision in another, and so prejudice still further her cause. Mr. Justice Lamar and the late Mr. Justice Campbell, both of the Supreme Court, are nearly akin by blood on the father's side to Mrs. Maybrick, and the opinion of Mr. Justice Lamar is as pronounced and as deliberate as that of the Chief Justice, but must be withheld for the same reasons. Of Mr. Justice Harlan, also a member of the Supreme Court and of the Behring Sea arbitration, the late Judge Campbell, the great uncle of Mrs. Maybrick, was an intimate friend, and his portrait presented by himself to Judge Harlan hangs in the latter's library. The warm, wide, large-hearted sympathy of Mr. Justice Field with the unhappy and the friendless, scarcely needs the stimulus of family and business association to which I have already referred.

The petition as forwarded was in these terms :

As Florence Ethel Maybrick is an American woman, without father, brother, husband, or kin in England, except two infant children, enduring penal servitude for life in Woking Prison;

As the conduct of her trial resulted in a profound impression of a miscarriage of justice, and an immediate and earnest protest against the verdict and against the execution of her sentence of death and in its commutation to penal servitude for life, on the ground of "reasonable doubt" whether a murder had been committed;

As a careful legal scrutiny of the evidence given at the trial, procured by American women and conducted by eminent English solicitors, barristers, Queen's counsel and members of Parliament, and the production of facts not in evidence at the trial, have resulted in a formal decision of counsel that the case is one proper for the grave consideration of a criminal appellate tribunal, if such a tribunal existed;

As no such tribunal exists;

As a bill is now pending in the House of Commons to establish a Court of Appeal in criminal cases, and as this bill is exactly applicable to Mrs. Maybrick's case, but can have no retrospective operation;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As Mrs. Maybrick's health is very delicate, she having been frequently in the infirmary of the prison, once from November to May, 1889-90, again from December to March, 1891-92; and as her family physician, Dr. MacGavin, 4 Rue St. Phillippe du Roule, Paris, officially advises Mrs. Maybrick's mother that "the strong tendency in her family to consumption, the confinement within the walls of a prison, together with the fearful mental depression incident to such a painful position, make it greatly to be feared that unless some change be speedily brought about, the same fate which befell her brother [death by rapid pulmonary consumption] will be that of Mrs. Maybrick";

Therefore we urgently ask that the Right Honorable Henry Matthews, Q. C., M. P., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, will advise Her Majesty to order the pardon and release of the prisoner, who has now suffered an imprisonment of nearly three years.

May 4, 1892.

This petition was signed by forty of the most representative names of the nation, including the Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; all the members of the cabinet; many chiefs of bureaus; the General commanding the army and several Brigadier Generals; Cardinal Gibbons, the highest authority of the Catholic Church in America, of whose communion are Mrs. Maybrick and her mother; the Minister to France; the Acting Judge Advocate-General; and others. Owing to the uncertainty—and the certainty—which had attended the petition of Mrs. Harrison, this petition was not laid before the President, so that he was not permitted the opportunity to sign it, but his countenance and assistance in the preparation and presentation of the previous petition—of which Your Majesty was respectfully informed—sufficiently indicate his sentiments.

The petition was not sent out to the sixty-five millions of the people of the United States because there was not time, in our great anxiety to hasten the restoration of the mother to her children, of the daughter to her mother; but the names signed are from all sections and from no sections, from all parties and all churches. Mrs. Maybrick, in her sufferings, as in her blood, unites the North and the South, the Democrat and the Republican, the old slaveholder, the old abolitionist, and the new nation which embraces both; the old Confederate, the old Unionist, and the new American, who knows but one flag.

To-day comes the answer to the petition from Lord Salisbury:

"Taking the most lenient view which the facts proved in evidence, and known to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, admit of, the case of this convict

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was that of an adulteress attempting to poison her husband, under the most cruel circumstances, while she pretended to be nursing him on his sick bed.

"The Secretary of State regrets that he has been unable to find any ground for recommending to the Queen any further act of clemency towards the prisoner."

It is my purpose now to call Your Majesty's attention to this response to the American petition, only in point of its bearing upon the question of international amenity and amity.

As a just woman, whom God, through the laws of your country, has appointed Queen of England, I call Your Majesty to witness that Mrs. Osborne, an English woman of high connections, of great wealth, after the perpetration of a grave crime, persisted in, with complications that render it incredibly malignant, and confessed only when exposure was inevitable, received sentence of only a few months' imprisonment, and was pardoned after a few weeks of incarceration. We in America rejoice in this exercise of your royal clemency, believing that unfortunate woman to be in a measure irresponsible, and believing that the ends of justice have been fully answered.

Mrs. Montagu, also an English subject of wealth and high connections, confessedly and undeniably guilty of a crime so monstrous that it might be said in all Christendom

"Was no mother,
But spat towards her and hissed;
No child, but screamed out curses
And shook its little fist."

—guilty of the slaughter of her helpless infant through hours of torture—was sentenced to an imprisonment of but one year.

Alfred Rubery, convicted in the United States on abundant and undenied evidence of an attempt on vast property and many lives, "under the most cruel circumstances," at a time when men's minds were in a state of high excitement, and life and property in great peril through civil war, was promptly pardoned by the President of the United States at the first asking of one prominent Englishman, "as a mark of respect and good will" to him.

Mrs. Maybrick, of eminent family, but poor and an American, convicted under a judge then probably, and soon after certainly, stricken with mental disease, so that he was forced by public opinion to resign from the bench; convicted on a trial so imperfect that a council of English lawyers and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of Parliament certify to its insufficiency, and the Secretary of State reverses its verdict; languishing in life-long imprisonment under a charge of attempt to murder, for which she was never indicted, tried, or convicted except by the Home Secretary in the seclusion of his own department, and under the implication of adultery, for which she was never indicted or tried, and which was never proved beyond the assertion that it is "known to the Home Secretary," and which, if proved, is not punishable under the English law with imprisonment for life;—this American woman is immured in Woking Prison, and, to the agonized entreaties of her mother, to the tender urgency of the wife of the President of the United States, to the respectful petition of the most eminent men of this country, the English government, in a time of profound peace, makes answer:

The convict is an adulteress who attempted to poison her husband. She shall die in her prison!

We cannot yet believe that this voice is the voice of Victoria —the gentle, friendly, yet just and commanding voice that won our hearts in all the din and tumult of war. I intrust this letter to the public as the lover flings his note over the garden wall that guards his lady's bower, hoping that some kind breeze may waft it to the beloved feet;—and we may find our Queen again.

But if, indeed, a mockery must be; if great kings must courtesy to nice customs; if your Majesty must be set upon the mercy-seat before all England and the world, yet be forbidden to show mercy, I beg to offer you the homage of a profound regret.

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ERRATIC PLATFORMS OF THE DEMOCRACY.

BY THE HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM VERMONT.

IN EVERY age, where liberty and human progress have made notable advances, there comes a time when a brood of stragglers in the rear appear to denounce the progress made as nothing worth, and to demand the restoration of the Bourbons with all of the conditions which once restricted the greater part of mankind to less of freedom, to less of the comforts of life, and to less of intellectual individuality, but which gave to a stupid aristocracy political supremacy. Against such progress the United States has heretofore had its recalcitrants, its Silver-greys, its Copperheads, and now its Mugwumps.

Denied all protection by our British ancestors, the several States at the close of the War of Independence surrendered to the nation the sole power to protect domestic industries by a tariff on imports of foreign merchandise, and the logical result appears in the foremost act of Congress, July 4, 1789, under President Washington, as follows :

"Whereas it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

This tariff act, the earliest of our fathers', admitted not only teas but all imported merchandise at a less rate of duty if imported in ships built and owned by citizens of the United States. It also imposed a specific and protective duty on cotton of three cents per pound, and authorized bounties to be paid on dried and pickled fish and on salted provisions when exported. This was the decisive way in which the gifted framers of the constitution practically administered it. The whole scope of the act, untrammeled by the mother country, clearly announced an American policy, and determined that our country should not become the mere "pasturage for the progeny of foreign kine."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Republican platform adopted by the Congressional caucus in 1800—and the Democratic party still claim that it then bore the name of Republican—contained as one of its planks the following :

"Encouragement of science and the arts in all their branches, to the end that the American people may perfect their independence of all foreign monopolies, institutions, and influences."

Democratic Mr. Dallas, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his report on the protective tariff of 1816, stated what was true then and equally true to-day, that:

"There are few if any governments which do not regard the establishment of domestic manufactures as a chief object of public policy. The United States have always so regarded it."

The tariff received every vote in the Senate except five, and three of the five were from New England. In the House of Representatives the bill was championed by Mr. Calhoun, who said : "Gentlemen ought not to give in to the contracted idea that taxes were so much money taken from the people ; properly applied, the money proceeding from taxes was money put out to the best possible interest for the people." The "contracted ideas" of Mr. Cleveland certainly need instruction, if not the birch rod of the schoolmaster.

The protective-tariff bill presented March 4, 1828, by Rollin C. Mallory, of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, was accompanied by a report written by that eminent Democrat, Silas Wright, Jr., of New York. This bill, while the majority of both Houses of Congress was Democratic, contained specific, compound, square yard, and minimum duties, and all the grim features that are now so wont to set the teeth of Free-traders on edge, received in the Senate the votes of such distinguished Jacksonian Democrats as James K. Polk, Dutee J. Pearce, Martin Van Buren, James Buchanan, Silas Wright, Jr., Joel Yancey, Thomas H. Benton and Richard M. Johnson. Three of these distinguished men were subsequently elected to the Presidency by the Democratic party. Assuredly Van Buren, Buchanan, Wright, and Benton were not densely ignorant of practical political economy, nor of the constitutional doctrines of their party, but to-day they would have to retire as heretics and give place to those known as Democrats only because they say so and subscribe to the latest Chicago platform.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1840 the Democratic National Platform set forth :

"That the constitution does not confer upon the general government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements."

The immense subsidies of land to the Illinois Central and other railroads were granted under the lead of Mr. Douglas a few years later. They also then tolerated "differences of opinion," and therefore resolved not to nominate any one for Vice-President on the ticket with Mr. Van Buren, but there was not a word about the tariff.

In 1844 their platform favored "the reoccupation of Oregon and the annexation of Texas," with nothing about the tariff.

From 1789 to 1828 Democrats and Federalists, however widely apart on some other questions, practically agreed on the protection of home products. With such Southern statesmen long in the lead as Jefferson and Madison, Jackson and Benton, Clay and Calhoun, a tariff for home protection, as well as for revenue, was authoritatively fixed as the paramount and permanent American policy. If there had been any doubt in 1789 that this would not become our future national policy, it is not too much to say that the State-protection policy then practically prevailing would not have been surrendered, and our constitution could not have been ratified by the several States.

The Calhoun era of secession and nullification finally constrained the Democratic party to adopt the partisan tariff of 1846. This tariff put the same rate of duty on pig-iron and scrap-iron as upon manufactures of iron, steel, gold, or silver ; the same upon wool as upon Turkey and Wilton carpets, and more upon firewood, sugar, and molasses than upon manufactures of silk. These are only specimen bricks of the Walker tariff, which, after being horizontally amended in 1857, failed to give either protection or revenue sufficient for the ordinary support of the government. From 1847 to 1857 our imports, exclusive of specie, exceeded our exports by $313,073,805, and the excess of our exports of specie amounted to $258,853,228.

The tariff of 1861 was made largely specific and consequently more steadily protective. The compound duties on woollens by weight and ad valorem were there first introduced as compensatory to protective duties on wool, and, as far as possible, higher duties were imposed upon luxuries than upon articles of general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consumption. It also largely increased the number of articles on the free list.

This tariff, it may not be too much to say, contained the vertebræ upon which have been built all the subsequent protective-tariff statutes. The expense of the War of the Rebellion and its prodigious legacy of public debt, made a vast increase of revenue a public necessity. The rates of duty had to be increased because the protective home industries soon began to reduce prices and to limit the extent of imported articles from which revenue was obtainable. The increase of our population was wondrously large, notwithstanding the sore losses in the conflict of the Rebellion, but an annual revenue of sixty or seventy-five million dollars, once very adequate, suddenly had to be quadrupled. If this is now a burden it is a burden imposed by the unpatriotic Confederate action of those who now, perhaps, complain the most and bear the smallest share of it. Unquestionably the Free-traders of Southern States, on account of their far milder climate and their six million of colored citizens, contribute only a small share comparatively of tariff revenue, as they consume of dutiable foreign merchandise but a small part of what would be their due proportion according to their representative population.

For nearly sixty years of the republic a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, was firmly established, and so revered by our fathers, and especially by the Democratic party, that no murmur was raised against it in any quarter, save by the "Nullifiers" of South Carolina, the chief of whom President Jackson wanted to hang. But modern Democracy has so lapsed and degenerated from its ancient opinions and principles that it is now ready to accept the doctrine of the rebel Confederate constitution in its national tariff platform, or the ideas and trickery of Tammany pettifoggers, if only the victors are baited with the promise of the spoils of office. That it may be seen whether or not this is unfounded criticism, it may be well to further resurrect some of these Democratic platforms, not long dead, but so tainted that it may be well for any old and time-honored Democrat either to shun them or to hold his nose.

In 1852 their platform announced:

"That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles in the Kentucky and Virginia resolution of 1798 and 1799."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some sly objections also against protection began to peep out,

"Like the toes of some maiden's shoes
Beneath a mass of furbelows,"

and were presented as follows:

"That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other."

There is no instance where any such detriment has been done by a protective tariff. On the contrary, the whole American continent is decorated with the monuments of its blessings. Fostering manufactures cannot fail to benefit all branches of industry, and especially of agriculture, by the creation of more consumers of agricultural and other products.

In 1856 their platform once more abided by the resolutions of 1798, and it was resolved:

"That it is time to declare for free seas and for progressive free trade throughout the world."

Progressive free trade is throughout the world still a barren theory, everywhere practically on the retrograde, with many grumblers even in its British and only home, and not favored by any progressive European democrat, but in 1856 the Democratic platform makers here, possibly when half seas over, indulged in the foregoing brief and silly flirtation with free trade.

In 1860 the platform of both the Breckinridge and Douglas wings of the party, repeated the tariff resolution of 1856, and favored aid to a Pacific railroad. The party has twice been in favor of large land grants to railroads and twice against them. Both wings of the party flopped together in 1860 on the following resolution:

"That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of Cuba on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain."

They again flirted with the tariff, but, as ever, very earnestly sought to give slavery greater chances of extension in our territories.

In 1864 the Democratic platform, with no mention of the tariff, showed the white feather and declared that, "after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war," they demanded "that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities." Their candidate for the Presidency, Gen. McClellan, spat upon the platform, and all but three of the States appear to have expectorated on both platform and candidate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1868 their platform demanded "the payment of the public debt as rapidly as practicable," and when not otherwise expressed, that it should "be paid in lawful money of the United States," that is to say, "greenbacks." In the sixth resolution of their platform, "incidental protection to domestic manufactures" was demanded, but it was to be derived from the internal revenue laws. This dubious way of gathering grapes from thorns and figs from thistles was seriously proposed as follows:

"A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under internal revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will without impairing the revenue impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country."

This hybrid protection of the domestic manufactures of iron, wool, and cotton by an internal revenue tax upon the domestic production of whiskey and tobacco was a Democratic discovery, but a dull world failed to see that it indicated anything more than the prepotency of some platform ass.

In 1872 the Democratic National platform contained the following words:

"That there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective system of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in the congressional districts and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation."

The straight-out Democratic National platform at Louisville in 1872 would not indorse Horace Greeley for the Presidency, but not from hostility to any protective doctrine, as the following resolution will show:

"Resolved, that the interests of labor and capital should not be permitted to conflict, but should be harmonized by judicious legislation. While such a conflict continues, labor, which is the parent of wealth, is entitled to paramount consideration."

In 1876 the National Democratic platform demanded "a tariff for revenue only," and in 1880 the important change made read as follows: "We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue," and the difference was as lucid as that between "an old cocked-up hat" and "a cocked-up old hat," but, as the learned author insisted, they were synonymous, and must both be interpreted the same as British free trade. But the very next Democratic Convention incontinently unloaded its free-trade

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

synonyms of 1876 and 1880, and, though rather sullenly, straddled back to the doctrine of moderate protection.

In 1884 the Democratic National platform, after the usual vituperative denunciation of Republicans, and a pledge to reduce the revenue to the lowest limit, contained the following:

"Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsible to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. . . . Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. . . . The necessary reductions in taxation can and must be affected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country."

These elaborate and fair promises, made perhaps only to deceive Democrats and laborers who favored protection, beyond doubt had their effect, and Mr. Cleveland thus obtained the Presidency.

In 1888 the Democratic National platform on the tariff was more compact but not less emphatic for the protection of American labor, and sought popular support in the following words:

"Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not, and need not, be endangered by a reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference of the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operation."

These lamb-like phrases failed to hide the wolf which had been uncovered by the proposals of a Democratic House of Representatives, as well as by the free-trade message of the Democratic President in 1887, and Mr. Cleveland was defeated in the election of 1888.

The Democratic National platform of 1892, as finally amended, no longer concealed the purpose of adopting British free trade to its utmost limit, not only promising to repeal the McKinley tariff, but reckless of all prior protection assurances, promulgates the latest revision of its tariff creed as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"We denounce the Republican protective tariff as a fraud upon the labor of the great majority of American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal goverment has not constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the government when honestly and economically administered."

This cuts up all protection at the roots by the denial of constitutional powers to cover any idea but that of raising revenue, and would force the imposition of very high duties on sugar, teas, and coffee, that we do not and cannot produce, and very low duties on all manufactures that we can produce, in order to obtain sufficient revenue by giving up the American market to an enormous increase in the importation of foreign manufactures. So much of the party as were at Chicago suddenly swears eternal friendship to principles that admit of no modification, "for the enforcement and supremacy of which," Mr. Cleveland has declared, "all who have any right to claim Democratic fellowship must constantly and persistently labor."

If there was a shadow of doubt, as there is not, about the meaning of the present Democratic tariff platform, it would vanish upon sight of what was originally proposed and rejected to give place to the aforesaid final amendment. Their Committee had proposed to run the campaign of 1892 on the moderately protective platform of 1884, which professed to be regardful of both labor and capital, especially of the difference in cost of American and foreign labor, and not to injure domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. All this and more was suddenly stricken out and clearly demonstrates that it is the purpose now to bolt and rivet the Democratic party to the British doctrine of free trade, which Great Britain maintains solely for the purpose of keeping down the wages of British laborers to the lowest point, in order to obtain an overpowering export trade in competition with foreign nations, by which to get food for more than half of its population.

Even if the Democratic party should fail now to win, with the voters of one or two Northern States combined with a "solid South," and flop back in 1896 to the platitudes in behalf of home industries, it could not then be trusted. Much less can it be trusted now that it hoists the black flag and wages a war of absolute extermination against any and all tariff protection. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issue tendered is that labor must take care of itself, and that capital must seek for protection in other countries.

For the last forty years the Democratic party platforms might have been properly advertised, like dramatic star actors, "to appear for this time only." They have long ceased to represent any abiding principle, and merely point, as may a wooden rooster on some barn, to the shifting currents of the wind.

For the past generation the melancholy history of the party has been so equivocal and desperate, and the platform botchery of its leaders so sterile of popular favor, that they are now ready to renounce all former pretensions of love for the men of home industries, as well as all regard for the general welfare of our native land. They would even offer unconditional free trade to our great British rival rather than reciprocity to the South American republics.

The Democratic party of the North purchases its alliance with the "Solid South" by the surrender of all protection to American industries and a tame submission to the precise terms of the late loved and lost Confederate constitution, which, after the grant of the power to lay and collect taxes and duties, concludes as follows:

"But no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry."

It is unnecessary to say that this Confederate prohibition, or anything like it, is not to be found in the constitution of the United States, and yet the Democratic party is now pledged to enforce and give it practical validity throughout the Union, though it is merely a free-trade ghost supposed to haunt the original Confederate States, where it once found an unhonored grave.

The erratic and contradictory declarations of National Democratic conventions on paper money, on internal improvements, and other subjects than the tariff, have long been conspicuous. For example, their convention in 1888 resolved as follows:

"That the territories of Washington, Dakota, Montana, and New Mexico are by virtue of population and development entitled to admission into the Union as States, and we unqualifiedly condemn the course of the Republican party in refusing statehood and self-government to their people."

And yet when the Republicans admitted to statehood four ter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ritories in 1890, their admission was resisted and loud protestations came forth from Democrats that it was only Republican partisanship that conceived or consented to the policy, and not that the territories were entitled to admission.

The progenitors of the Democratic free-trade platforms, twelve and sixteen years ago, which led to the disastrous miscarriage of the party, do not appear to have learned any wisdom at the late Chicago Convention, and now seem to rejoice at again beholding the swelling front of the Democratic party suddenly pregnant with free trade. It was enough for their platform-makers to know that the party in power, the Republican party, supported the ancient Democratic doctrine of "a tariff for revenue with incidental protection," to arouse suspicion that it was all wrong and not Democratic. It was as clear that Republicans favored protection, as it was that Democrats formerly favored it, and that was enough to excite ever present partisan hostility to the principle of a protective tariff, forgetful that there were among our citizens millions of Democratic protectionists, and forgetful that they were assailing the character of statesmen who gave the Democratic party its earliest and greatest renown.

When Mr. Cleveland was defeated for the Presidency in 1888, it was often said by many of his Democratic supporters that his free-trade hobby, which he mounted in 1887, ran away with him. It has been asserted, also, that he became reluctant to again ride his balky steed, and proposed at the Chicago convention to mount in 1892 a much tamer and slower going Rozinante, but the Tammany braves and Hill Democrats—who had vociferously declared that Cleveland, if nominated, could not be elected—refused to further depreciate his political horsemanship, and therefore insisted in their platform upon again mounting him upon the same sore-backed free-trade hobby, apparently not caring a dime whether it should again run away with the jockey or not.

The Democratic leaders were obviously ready to enlist under any banner, Christian or Moslem, that was most distasteful to the faction that would not consent to the nomination of Mr. Hill. In the nomination of Mr. Cleveland their forlorn hope is to retain the support of the political dilettanti, best known as the Mugwumps, who were once successfully baited with "revenue reform," and believed to be now too lazy and gouty to escape the free-trade trap.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Mr. Cleveland, when accepting the nomination in his speech, July 20th, appeared unready to accept that portion of the party platform which declares that the "government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only," and made his prompt dissent about so attacking "tariff laws" as follows:

"We need not base our attack upon questions of constitutional permission or legislative power."

The vituperative fertility shown, however, in high-seasoned commentaries on the theory of tariff protection will no doubt satisfy even free-trade Hotspurs that no one of them can lead where Mr. Cleveland will not follow. It may be true that he once committed himself against being a Presidential candidate for the second time, but evidently not against a third time. He will no doubt be equally adroit in adhering to his convictions on the tariff question.

For a whole century the American encouragement of the mechanical arts and manufactures has generally prevailed. This encouragement has absorbed in fixed investments the greater part of the surplus capital of the country. Outside of those engaged in agriculture, it has given remunerative employment to the largest number of American workingmen, skilled and life-trained in the arts and manufactures, and whose products surpass in annual amount those of any other people.

The Democratic party proposes that all this shall be suddenly changed and have no consideration. The issue they tender in the coming national contest is, that American capital and American labor shall have no more protection than foreign capital and foreign labor. If Americans will not work as cheaply as foreign artisans, they must hold the plow and hoe, and no longer fraternize with steam engines, but banish from their home all the labor-saving machinery to which they have given birth and for which they have the highest aptitudes.

For the past ten years it is believed that twenty-five million dollars have been annually taken from Northern States and invested in manufactures in the so-called "New South." The Democratic policy of free trade would confiscate all such irremovable investments as remorselessly as those of earlier birth and of infinitely greater magnitude in Northern and Western States, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as entitled by the free-trade creed to no better treatment than that of aliens and enemies.

Laboring men may be told, as they were last year told by Mr. Gladstone, that we should not have "mills and factories to produce yarn and cloth which could be had cheaper abroad," but this would compel the great multitude now employed in "mills and factories" to change their vocation to that of increasing the crops of cotton, corn and wheat, reducing the prices of such crops for the benefit of foreign purchasers.

Free trade builds up a few great importing cities on the sea shore, and creates millionaires in foreign trade. It depopulates the rural districts, and has nothing but lip-service to offer those who toil for their daily bread. It would give to the latter the dearer cost of living and the 77 per cent. less of wages which free trade in England offers to those who labor. It already rejoices at every calamity which grieves home industries, and would make our imports always to exceed our exports, keep us always in debt and always poor.

Republicans believe that our government should have great and noble purposes, beyond the mere power to levy and collect taxes. They also hold that every heartbeat of political parties should be in harmony with the hum of diversified and universal industry, and that the political parties should contribute by their patriotism, faith, and good works to make our country great and prosperous—great in its political institutions, great in the wealth of its intellectual, moral and material achievements.

JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TARIFF PLANK AT CHICAGO.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

BEFORE examining its latest declaration on the tariff question, it may be well to review the utterances of the Democratic party in prior national conventions. The keynote of its whole platform in 1876 was Reform, and among the urgent reforms called for was reform "in the sum and modes of federal taxation." It denounced, in detail, the existing law as "a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretence," and set forth its own doctrine in these words:

"We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

In 1880 the party pledged itself anew to its "constitutional doctrines and traditions," among which it put "a tariff for revenue only."

These declarations were not made in the face of an enemy, for the tariff was not an issue in these elections until the closing weeks of the campaign of 1880, when the Republicans suddenly brought it forward in the manufacturing districts of the country, to the surprise and somewhat to the confusion of their adversaries.

By 1884, however, the situation had changed. The somewhat non-partizan attempt to secure a revision of the tariff in 1882 by a Tariff Commission had been thwarted by the success of the protected industries in capturing the Commission, and the bill which they extorted from a dying and discredited Republican Congress, March 3, 1883, had not reduced the surplus or lightened the burdens of the taxpayer. Accordingly, when the Forty-eighth Congress met, in December, 1883, those who favored a vigorous continuance of the fight for Tariff Reform controlled the Democratic caucus and organized the House with Mr. Carlisle as Speaker. But the caucus could not swing the party vote behind the Morrison Bill, and the defeat of that bill, through a division in the ranks, carried the controversy into the national convention.

The platform which, after a long and arduous struggle,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emerged from the Committee on Resolutions, and was adopted by the convention of 1884 was not so much "a straddle" as a piece of ill-joined patchwork, the work of many hands.

It demanded that "federal taxation should be exclusively for public purposes," but "subject" to certain specified "limitations." The most noteworthy of these "limitations" were: The party pledged itself to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests; that in reducing taxes it was not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but to promote their hearty growth; that custom-house taxes must remain, as from the foundation of the government they have been, the chief source of revenue; that as many industries have come to rely on legislation for their successful continuance, any change of law must be, at every step, regardful of the labor and capital thus involved; that necessary reduction of taxes must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates than would be ample to cover any increased cost of production due to the higher wages of our labor; that sufficient revenue could be had from custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and lightest on articles of necessity.

This platform showed division, not unity, in the party. It was an attempt to bridge a chasm, not to close it.

The clear-cut and explicit declaration of 1876 and 1880 in favor of tariffs for revenue only was smothered under a superincumbent mass of so-called "limitations." But these "limitations" were, in the main, merely pledges as to the *method* of reducing taxes and promises as to its *effect*, with a concession to the fears of the labor vote which was still clinging to the skirts of protection. Such a platform, the best attainable at the time with party harmony, could not unite the party's representatives for actual work, and the second Morrison Bill, even with the favor of a Democratic administration, met the fate of the first. But the work of unification was going on, and Mr. Cleveland's message of 1887 made Tariff Reform the party issue. The Mills Bill was passed by a practically full party vote, in a House having a meagre Democratic majority, as compared with the Houses that killed the Morrison Bill. The national convention of 1888, in renominating Mr. Cleveland, adopted the tariff resolution of 1884, as interpreted by his message, and approved the Mills Bill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The campaign of education went on, nothing checked by Mr. Cleveland's defeat, and received an immense impetus from the McKinley Bill of 1890.

When the recent convention met at Chicago, the representatives of the Democratic party were united and zealous in their devotion to tariff reform, and full of the confidence born of many victories freshly won under its banner. They expected a clear and courageous statement of fundamental party principle and of the party's attitude to existing laws. The resolution as reported by the committee left nothing to be desired on the latter head, but instead of the former contained a preliminary paragraph or two, in which, with much that was admirable, appeared some of the familiar but now unsatisfactory phrases of the make-shift of 1884. The convention, with very slight protest from the Committee on Platform, took the risk of striking out these phrases and their setting and of inserting in place of them a clear declaration of fundamental party doctrine. The inserted words are:

> We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the government honestly and economically administered.

This is no new doctrine. It is a return to the frank and explicit declaration of 1876 and 1880, showing that the party is now ready to avow in the thick of battle what it then avowed before the combat opened.

The Democratic party has always maintained the principle that the power to impose and collect taxes in aid of any private enterprise is beyond the scope of legislation, and does not pass, under free government, even with the general grant of legislative power. This doctrine has been upheld, in a long series of decisions in the State and Federal courts, when efforts have been made to use the taxing power in the States for other than public or revenue purposes. The principle is the same when Congress undertakes to "impose and collect tariff duties" in aid of private enterprise or for the support of special industries, but there is no way in which the question can be raised, for the law imposing them always appears on its face to be a law to raise revenue, and courts cannot inquire into the motives of Congress in passing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it. Even Mr. Randall, in his speech in the House, in 1882, on the Tariff Commission Bill, said :

> **"I do not favor a tariff enacted on the ground of protection for the sake of protection, because I doubt the existence of any constitutional warrant for any such construction, or the grant of any such power."**

The denial of the right of the federal government to "impose and collect" tariff duties for the sake of protection is merely saying in a different form of words that under a government of equal rights there can be no class legislation. It is, therefore, in effect, but a re-statement of the position taken by the party in 1876 and in 1880, and it does not necessarily imply any radical departure from the methods of tariff reduction, to which it was deemed best to give more prominence in 1884, than to the great principle that demanded such reduction.

There is need for little comment upon the paragraphs of the report of the committee which were stricken out in convention. They were no longer aids, but incumbrances in the fight. The temper and the courage of the party are mightily different in 1892 from what they were in 1884 ; what was necessary prudence then would be cowardice now. The convention responded fully and heartily to the feeling of the party it represented. It showed its confidence in tariff reform as the great and winning issue by its nomination of Mr. Cleveland in the face of warnings that would have driven it from a man who did not also stand for a cause. It meant that there should be nothing ambiguous about the party's attitude to that cause, and that the statement of its fundamental principle should not be overlaid with cumulative limitations. And in all this the convention was right. We have passed that stage in the great tariff controversy where it is necessary or proper to cumber party platforms with limitations and promises and protests. After the Mills Bill and the special bills passed by the present House, it is superfluous to assure the people that the Democratic party will proceed carefully and conservatively in reducing the tariff. In dealing with this as with every other long-standing abuse interwoven with our social or industrial system, the statesman will always remember that in the beginning temperate reform is safest, having in it the principle of growth.

In view of the immense increase in our annual expenditures, and the steady swelling of our pension list, it is equally unnecessary to repeat that taxes collected at the custom house must re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

main the chief source of our revenue. Ease and simplicity of collection will always give a preference to indirect taxes collected through a tariff of duties on imported articles. Such taxes are gathered at a few great seaports, and being incorporated with the price of the goods, as they enter the country, are finally paid by the consumers of those goods, as they buy them, from time to time. Instead of an army of federal taxgatherers swarming the country and gathering directly from the people, the government has a limited number of employees massed in a few custom houses. Instead of paying his entire tax bill at one time, the taxpayer pays his taxes by instalments scattered through his year's purchases. But in these very advantages lurk all the abuses of a hidden system of taxation, which, without constant vigilance, are sure to turn a tariff from being a convenient method of getting public revenue into a scheme of private emolument, such as we have in the McKinley Bill to-day. The power of the government to tax an article for revenue is seized by the private interest to tax a competitor out of the market, or to handicap him in his efforts to compete in the market.

A system of direct taxation would effectually check such extravagance as led to the Billion-Dollar Congress, and would prevent that partnership between the government and great private interests that is rife with political scandals and with unjust burdens to the people. But such a system was doubtless impracticable in the beginning and seems scarcely less so now. We are called upon as the urgent duty of the hour, and of all time, to guard against the perversion of our tariff system that has ripened into the McKinley Bill. From the wrongs that now oppress us under that bill, we must work back as rapidly as we can to a system where duties will be levied for purposes of revenue only, and, having reached that reform, we shall in due time so amend our tariff system as to purge it more and more of private extortion and of inequality of burden.

Nor can the Democratic party any longer derive strength from pandering to the delusion that protective duties can in any way directly benefit labor. The intelligent laboring man, whose vote is his own, knows better perhaps than any other man, for he knows by experience, that a protective tariff is a question of the "enhancement of the profits of capital," not of the "increase of the wages of labor which would reduce those profits."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The great battle seems so nearly won, if we look back at the unbroken series of victories since 1888, that we need not concern ourselves about methods and "limitations," but in the bold and honest statement of the fundamental position of our party may look henceforward for strength and for final triumph.

It is not necessary that I should review those paragraphs of the tariff plank which denounce the existing law and direct attention to the effects of "thirty years' restrictive taxes" upon the prosperity of agriculture, but I cannot refrain from saying, that there has been no juster statement of the sham reciprocity of the McKinley Bill than that contained in the section which may be called a part of the tariff plank of the Chicago platform.

In conclusion, as bearing upon the general subject, I would refer to "Two Congresses Contrasted," by ex-Speaker Reed, in the last number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in which he says of the present Congress: "The Democracy in the House, with a force of three to one, have not only done nothing with the tariff, but they have done nothing with anything else. Not one measure above the dignity of rye straw will mark the annals of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress."

It is perfectly natural that Mr. Reed should feel it his mission in life to vindicate the memory of the last House and its rules, and to contend that it fell a martyr to the blind wrath of the people, not a victim to their discriminating anger. No one will contest his right to speak for it living or dead, just as the senior member of the great firm of Snitchley & Craggs always spoke "for self and Craggs," and, after the death of his partner, "for self and Craggs deceased."

But it seems almost incredible that Mr. Reed, not as ex-Speaker and perpetual champion of the last House, but as member of the Committee of Ways and Means of the present House, should have so completely forgotten recent events as to affirm that the "Democracy have done nothing with the tariff." That committee, at the opening of the present Congress, for reasons that satisfied a majority of its Democratic members, decided to attack the tariff by a series of single bills rather than by a general revision. In executing this plan the committee, or members of it, framed and carried through the House six tariff bills, as follows: Putting wool on the free list and reducing duties on woolen goods; putting binding twine on the free list; removing duties

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from cotton ties, cotton bagging, and machinery for making cotton bagging; putting tin plate on the free list; admitting free of duty silver lead ores, and limiting the amount of wearing apparel that may be brought in free of duty.

These bills, as they were successively sent to the Senate, were all pigeonholed by its Committee on Finance; otherwise more bills of like character would have followed them. But in themselves they are a great and substantial contribution to Tariff Reform and show the fidelity of a Democratic House to its pledges, although powerless to carry its measures into laws because of a Republican Senate and Executive.

The Wool and Woollen Bill alone is a very great measure of Tariff Reform. It deals with the worst tax in the whole schedule, and if made a law, would mean cheaper, better and more abundant clothing to every man, woman and child in the country, with more employment to American workingmen to make that clothing, as also to make carpets and other woollen fabrics. No tariff bill could have been prepared more beneficent in its purpose or more universal in its relief. So is the Tin-Plate Bill a great and substantial measure, fostering many industries, and benefitting the canners and consumers of canned goods.

Indeed, Mr. Reed is estopped from saying that the present House has "done nothing with the tariff," for he and his associates of the minority declared over their own signatures, as these bills were successively reported from the committee, that they would cripple agriculture, destroy manufactures, rob American labor of employment, and generally bring untold disasters upon the country. Of the very least of them all, he said over his own signature, that "the removal of the duty would throw thousands of men out of employment, rendering millions of capital useless, and turning $2,000,000 annually to the laborers of other countries." If one small bill to put binding twine on the free list is to produce such tremendous results, what language can adequately portray the effects of all six bills? And how can Mr. Reed now say that the depraved Democracy, that tried to turn loose these dire plagues upon us, have "done nothing with the tariff"?

Truly, it looks as if the ruin of his country and the irreparable overthrow of American industries only momentarily diverted him from his great life-work of eulogizing "self and Craggs, deceased"!

WM. L. WILSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INNOCENCE VERSUS IGNORANCE.

BY AMÉLIE RIVES.

IT SEEMS hardly possible to open this subject, without at first becoming involved in a statement of axioms; for, on reflecting that Ignorance means a want of knowledge, and Innocence, freedom from guilt, purity, this thought at once presents itself —that, while a person, wanting in knowledge, may often be innocent, the very lack of knowledge may as often lead him into guilt.

And, conversely, that while another, thoroughly instructed in what guilt means, may of his free will indulge in, or refrain from, wrong-doing, the fact of such knowledge on his part, in no way affects the innocence of his nature, or actions, when according to his ideas of right and wrong he has done what he considers to be right.

Much has been written during the past two or three years upon this question, especially as it touches the moral education of young girls, and their relations to society at large, and domestic life in particular. There has been urged the desirability of the old system of maintaining certain kinds of ignorance, even at the expense of culture, and that knowledge of human affairs, without which human beings cannot be justly expected to fulfil worthily their duty to their fellow-creatures, whether that term be applied to their immediate family, or to that public with which necessarily they are directly, or indirectly, connected.

I must confess that my views on the subject are tersely stated in the following line by Browning:—

"Ignorance is not innocence, but sin."

No one will deny that an intelligent bystander would be culpable in allowing any one to grasp a non-insulated electric-wire in his bare hand, from a lack of knowledge which such an onlooker

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could supply; and yet people question the wisdom of instructing children and young girls in regard to moral matters, far more serious, where an admired ignorance might, indeed often does, lead them into permanently injuring themselves, both mentally and physically.

That the curiosity of childhood is both a natural and admirable trait seems a statement hardly likely to be disputed, and yet we not only find that it is disputed by many, but that such a view is nearly always condemned as lax and erroneous. Who has not heard some eager, intelligent child ask questions on religious or physical subjects which were at once hushed and reproved as "Naughty," "Disrespectful to God," "Not nice," "Things about which little boys and girls must not even think, much less ask questions." The child thus repulsed goes away to ponder these things in its own heart, or to discuss them with its playmates, who, in nine cases out of ten, fill its mind with the most distorted medley of approximate facts, which, conceding that the nature is a high one, overwhelms it with a miserable perplexity, or, as often unfortunately happens, rouses in it a morbid desire to hear more statements of a like character, and develops in it that form of corrupt taste which results in the hypocrisy and deceit of peeping into books which it knows would be forbidden by its superiors.

Not only have I thought constantly and deeply on this subject for many years, but I have had during that time intimate and affectionate relations with many children, both boys and girls, of widely varied natures; and the conclusion at which I have arrived is that this natural curiosity of growing minds in regard to all subjects should be met by older people with a wise and judicious tolerance, and satisfied by a disclosure of as much of what is the truth, as the grown person in question thinks the child capable of comprehending.

Any questioning of religion is, as a rule, treated by the same hush-do n't-be-naughty system. A little girl whom I know once asked her mother this sufficiently puzzling question, "Mother, dear, our Lord said to the poor thief, 'this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,' and then went down to hell for three days. Now, please explain to me how that was?" A friend suggested that "a thousand years with the Lord were as one day," and the child contented herself with this answer, whereas if her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question had been waived in the usual manner, it would probably have led to that religious brooding from which children so often suffer.

Of course, in the moral education of young girls, due reference should be had to their characteristics both of body and mind. Some intellects can digest and benefit by knowledge which would only burden and disturb those less strong, or those which are unduly excitable and imaginative. That which, according to my views, should be avoided, is a system of training from which all instruction, or at least all clear instruction, as to the rules of health and life, has been rigorously eliminated. A knowledge of the laws which govern physical nature seems to me not only the right of every thinking being, but the only means by which people will ever be brought to look simply, wisely, and innocently at certain fundamental facts, upon which rests the whole structure of existence.

"Will there never be a time when every mother will be the priestess of her children and family?" are words put into the mouth of Milton by Walter Savage Landor. "Our duties are simple and learnt easily. No sunrise but awakens one or the other of them into activity and growth. Boys are educated, girls are not; yet girls should be educated first and taught the most impressively. These slender graceful columns are not only the ornament but also the support of society. Men are the braver for the reverence they bear towards them, and in them do they find their reward."

There is no time in her life when an intelligent and thoroughly instructed young girl cannot be an aid and inspiration to all those who feel the need of her sympathy. Her brothers will confide in her, as they never would were she the morally one-sided and ignorant being instanced by some people as the only type of the refined and innocent maiden, and they will draw from her a strength and incentive to all high aims, and be illuminated by the light of a purity which shines, not through the opaque medium of ignorance, but through the clear texture of that lofty innocence which is the choice of what is worthy, made by one having the knowledge of good and evil.

However, the ignorance of children can hardly be remedied while the ignorance of the average mother remains what it now is. "There has never been a girl," says Confucius, "who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learned to bring up a child that she might afterwards marry." And yet how shall children be wisely brought up, until those who marry prepare themselves for the grave responsibilities which marriage brings? And how shall a girl, who is ignorant beforehand of every essential fact in connection with such responsibilities, assume them with intelligence when they devolve upon her?

If every modern girl, as did the Jewish maiden of old, were to look upon herself as the possible mother of a Messiah, how different would be the training, mental and physical, which she would herself demand.

It is my conviction that girls should be educated at least as soon as boys, and taught as impressively, if not more impressively than they are taught. Herbert Spencer says: "Men care comparatively little for erudition in woman, but very much for physical beauty, and good nature, and sound sense." He goes on to ask "How many conquests does the blue-stocking make through her extensive knowledge of history? What man ever fell in love with a woman because she understood Italian? Where is the Edwin, who was brought to Angelina's feet, by her German? But rosy cheeks and laughing eyes," he continues, "are great attractions. A finely-rounded figure draws admiring glances. The liveliness and good-humor that overflowing health produces go a great way towards establishing attachments."

Now it is an undisputed fact that the average man does care comparatively little for erudition in women, and very much for physical beauty, good nature, and sound sense, but on the other hand, where these last three attributes are supplemented by erudition, the cultured man cannot fail to be more attracted by their owner than were she imperfectly and unwisely educated. Rosy cheeks and laughing eyes, liveliness and good humor, are certainly great attractions, but as certainly they are not in themselves sufficient to establish that attraction when once it has been generated, or to produce the comprehending companionship without which marriage is only a social compromise. Learning and health have not proved to be incompatible in the case of men; why should they be so in the case of women? In both sexes overstudy produces the like disastrous results, but while Edwin may not have been brought to his Angelina's feet by her German, after her rosy cheeks and laughing eyes have accomplished that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

result, it will scarcely be supposed that, admitting *his* knowledge of German, he will not be pleased to find that Angelina shares this knowledge with him. No man ever fell in love with a woman *because* she understood Italian, but this accomplishment on her part, granting him to be a cultured man, would not put a barrier between them after she had won his love, but would rather increase his affection for her by adding to his admiration of her physical charm the delight of a sympathy in taste. Indeed, Spencer himself says: "Educate as highly as possible—the higher the better—providing no bodily injury is entailed." And the same great teacher goes on to say: "Perhaps nothing will so much hasten the time when body and mind will both be adequately cared for as a diffusion of the belief that the preservation of health is a *duty*. Few seem conscious that there is such a thing as physical morality."

But how shall health be preserved and physical morality obtained by those who are kept in ignorance of the laws by which health and physical morality are governed? A thinking child is never satisfied, when told to do a certain thing or to abstain from doing it, by the assertion, "You must do it because I, your parent, tell you that you must, and what I tell you is right." They wish to know why certain things are, in themselves, right, and it is justice that they should know.

As a mere matter of self defence such knowledge should be given to children. A mother who keeps it from them acts as foolishly as a hypothetical lioness who proceeds to tear out her young one's claws, that they may be as harmless as doves,—not reflecting that, unlike doves, they have no wings to bear them out of the dangers against which their claws would have protected them.

In no case are ignorant boys or girls perfectly safe, either with themselves or with others.

There is another way in which parents meet this question, and that is by saying—or thinking—"Oh, *my* children have none of these horrid tendencies! *My* children will never be exposed to such dangers!" No mother knows the tendencies of her children until she has established between her and them an intimate friendship in which confidences of every kind shall be freely made and returned, tempered by a judicious wisdom on her part, —for it is hardly necessary to state that all unessential details in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regard to facts, whether mental or physical, should be repressed by grown people in their disclosures to children.

The mother who reasons that she has never had any unusual or abnormal tendencies or temptations herself, and that therefore her children will not have them, might be helped by an analogy drawn from the following scientific fact mentioned by Darwin in his "Origin of Species." "A single bud out of many thousands produced year after year on the same tree, under uniform conditions, has been known suddenly to assume a different character; and buds on distinct trees, growing under different conditions, have sometimes yielded nearly the same variety; for instance, buds on peach trees producing nectarines, and buds on common roses producing moss-roses."

In addition to the more serious consequences involved by such ignorance it often causes young girls to be placed in a false light, and misjudged for what are to them the most innocent actions and statements.

To those who consider that a lack of knowledge constitutes innocence, and therefore imply that an embroidered flower is more truly innocent than any thinking child can ever be, no matter what the amount of restraint exercised over its reason and curiosity, these views can hardly seem judicious, but at least I venture to hope that there are many who will agree with me in my belief that Innocence is only in the highest sense worthy and useful when it is the result of choice, not of accident.

AMÉLIE RIVES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A FORECAST OF MR. GLADSTONE'S NEW ADMINISTRATION.

BY JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

"THE situation is the most complicated, and in many respects the most interesting that has occurred in the Parliamentary history of these islands." In these words a friend, who is a distinguished member of the House of Lords, writes to me about the crisis through which Great Britain and Ireland have just been passing—the crisis of the General Elections. Nothing can be more just than the estimate of the situation expressed in the words which I have just quoted. It is one of the most complicated and one of the most interesting political situations that have ever occurred in our Parliamentary history. A great political party has fallen—a party which came in six years ago fortified by one of the strongest numerical majorities that have ever in our time sustained an administration. All through the course of the six years' Parliament that majority kept dwindling away. At almost every bye-election—that is, an election caused by a death, or a resignation, or an appointment to office of some kind, judicial or otherwise, which did not permit the retention of a seat in the House of Commons—the government lost a vote and the opposition under Mr. Gladstone gained one. This process went on so fast and so far that the opposition began to feel convinced that whenever the general elections came around Mr. Gladstone would be sure to have a tremendous, an overwhelming majority at the polls. The elections have come and gone, and have not justified these expectations. The Tory government, of course, was defeated; that everyone on either side knew was certain to be the result, but the Liberals have not anything like the majority they expected. In fact, but for the Irish National party they would not have any majority at all—they would be low down in a minority. Now, let us look at the importance of this fact. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall do my best to look at it with the calm, unprejudiced eye of an outer observer, if I can, and shall try not to let my partizan feelings guide me in any way as regards my estimate of realities and of the existing situation.

The Liberal party will have an ample majority for carrying ordinary measures of reform and for maintaining themselves in office and in power. But they draw that majority from Ireland, and the first great reform they will have to undertake is the reorganization of the whole system of Irish government—in other words, Home Rule. Mr. Gladstone is pledged to make this his first important measure. No one doubts—I least of all men am likely to doubt—the sincerity of his determination. I am perfectly certain that Mr. Gladstone would not accept office at all at his time of life but for his noble and generous desire to carry Home Rule and so settle the Irish question. If he had a great English majority behind him he would have no real difficulty in accomplishing that object. But the result of the elections suggests some serious difficulties in the way, not of the final triumph of Home Rule—about that no reasonable man can have any serious doubt—but about the immediate result. For it is certain that the House of Lords will be greatly emboldened to throw out a Home Rule Bill by the fact that the majority in favor of Home Rule is not found in England or in Scotland or in Wales, but in Ireland. I wish to make myself clear upon this point. A majority of the Scottish representatives and of the Welsh representatives are undoubtedly in favor of Home Rule, but these are not numerically strong enough to counterbalance the numbers of the English Tories.

The truth is that we have not even yet got a fair chance of ascertaining at an election the views of the majority of the English people—or even of the English voters. In the meantime, however, the House of Lords will unquestionably take courage from the fact that the majority which returns Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals to office is a majority composed of Irish Nationalist members. If the Irish Nationalist members could be induced to withdraw their support from Mr. Gladstone he would have to go out of office. Of course the great argument of the Anti-Home Rulers has been that Great Britain and Ireland are all one, and that there is no need for a separate system of Irish legislation. On this principle it would be logically absurd to say that a majority of Irishmen in favor of Mr. Gladstone ought to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

count for less than a majority of Englishmen. But the Lords will not reverence logic or shrink from absurdity. They will say: "We already knew the opinion of the Irish members. We knew they were for separation and rebellion and flat burglary and all the rest of it. What we wanted to know was the opinion of Great Britain; and, lo and behold you, here we have it, in the fact that Mr. Gladstone's majority is not drawn from Great Britain, but from Ireland. Why, then, should we hesitate to throw out a measure which has not the support of the majority of the people of Great Britain, and has only the support of a majority of our hereditary enemies, the people of Ireland?"

Now undoubtedly this is an inconvenient position for Mr. Gladstone to be placed in. The House of Lords in the end can easily be disposed of, Suppose Mr. Gladstone were to send up the Home Rule measure—having carried it successfully through the Commons—the House of Lords would no doubt throw it out. What would Mr. Gladstone do then? Appeal to the country against the House of Lords, many people here have been saying—have another general election and see if the popular vote would not further strengthen him. Now in my opinion Mr. Gladstone will do nothing of the kind. I am convinced that he will not allow to the House of Lords the honor and glory of dictating to the country the time when there is to be a general reelection of a representative chamber. Whatever he may do, that I feel convinced he will not do. He can send up a new Home Rule Bill in the next session—the same bill cannot be introduced twice in one session—and then if the House of Lords should threaten to reject it a second time he can retaliate on the House with the menace of the creation of new peers—a sufficient number of new peers to out-top the combined numerical strength of those who are opposed to Home Rule. When once a Prime Minister can make announcement that the Sovereign has authorized him to undertake a fresh creation of peers for a special purpose there is an end to the controversy. The existing peers hold out no longer. Why should they? What would be the good? The measure which they detested would be carried in either case—only if they stood out they would have to submit to the introduction of a crowd of new peers into their sacred chamber. The threat therefore is quite enough. The "gone coon" of the peerage always comes down. The menace has never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been made in my days. It was last made as a means of compelling the peers to pass the great Reform Bill of 1832. I do not think it is likely that we shall be compelled to have recourse to anything of the kind in 1892.

Therefore I take it for granted that when the end comes the peers will quietly give in and allow the Home Rule measure to pass. In the meantime, however, there must be a delay if, as I fully expect, the House of Lords should muster up the courage to throw out the Home Rule Bill on its first presentation to them. Then Mr. Gladstone would probably call an early sitting of the next session and bring in the bill again. But something could be done in the meantime, and that is just the question which I wish my readers to consider. We suppose the House of Lords to have thrown out the Home Rule Bill on its first introduction. What can Mr. Gladstone propose to do in the meantime?

I may perhaps be allowed to explain to American readers that our way of conducting an election here is quite unlike anything known in the United States. We do not hold our general elections on one and the same day throughout these two islands; we do not anywhere close the public houses, but on the contrary we leave them open and in full swing; and we allow to a voter as many votes as he has property or other qualification to secure to him. A voter in England may have a vote out of his place of business in the City of London—the city, properly so called—that part of London which is under the municipal jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor. He may have another vote for his dwelling-house in the West End of London. He has perhaps a country house in one of the shires, and he has a vote because of that. He may have two or three country houses, and he is entitled to a vote for each in the electoral division to which it belongs. He has a shooting place in Scotland—and he gets a vote in the Scottish division for that. He has a hunting place in one of the great English hunting counties, and he has a vote for that. There is no limit but the limit of property and possession to the number of votes a man may have in these countries. Our system of allowing the elections to be held on all manner of different days makes this plurality of votes a substantial reality. A voter thus happily endowed has plenty of time to make practical use of his privilege.

The late elections have covered something like a fortnight of time. According to our electoral law the writs or warrants for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the holding of elections are issued by the Speaker at Westminster and are sent to all the constituencies. They are not quite indeterminate as to time—the elections must be taken within a smaller number of days in boroughs and a larger number of days in counties. But the law is sufficiently vague to leave a very considerable margin of days at the discretion of the local authorities. If you are a candidate for a parliamentary seat in Great Britain or Ireland you may be elected on the first or second day this week, while your friend and colleague in a parliamentary party does not have his fate decided until the end of the week following. The local authorities are usually supporters of the party in power, and they will naturally fix the days of voting to suit the convenience of their own friends. Therefore we may be sure that if in some county division rather remote from London there are several voters who live habitually in London, and who have votes in divisions near London, the arrangements will be so made as to give them ample time to get down to the remoter constituency and record their votes. In this way the plurality of votes comes to be a serious thing. A return of majorities is only a return of a majority of votes and not of a majority of voters. It is quite possible to have a majority of votes without a majority of voters. It is quite possible to have a political party sent into power by a majority of votes without a majority of voters.

I need hardly point out that this tells heavily against the Liberal party. The great strength of that party is found in the working democracy—and the artizans in the towns and the peasants on the lands do not as a rule have many different properties, and many different parks and pleasances in England, and shooting-boxes in Scotland and fishing-lodges in Wales, and town-houses in the West End of London. Therefore there has been of late years a strong wave of popular feeling swelling up against this plural vote system which gives plurality to property and to property only ; and it has taken the definite form of demand for the system of One Man, One Vote. The first great reform, after Home Rule, to which the Radical party will apply itself will be the reform which gives to each man, rich or poor, one vote and one vote only. We shall no doubt come to have all our general elections held on the same day ; but if we had got rid of the plurality of votes the one day for all the elections would be a matter of very minor importance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another necessary and imperative reform is a change in the system of registration. "Tedious it were to tell, and hard to hear," as Shakespeare's Petruchio says, if I were to attempt to explain to American readers the tortuosities of our registration system—the system of record which finally affirms a man's right to have a vote. It is enough to say that although a voter may be perfectly entitled to his vote he has to fight his corner and prove his case at every annual registration, or he loses his vote—if any one objects to having his vote recorded. It is an annual case of proving over and over again your right to what is your own. Now what the Liberals say is—it ought to be the duty of the local authorities to secure a man's right whether he is able to attend the registration court and bear witness to it or not. The local authorities have no difficulty in finding out whether a man is or is not bound to pay so much a year in taxes and so much a year in poor-rates. They take very good care that each person so liable shall pay up his taxes and his rates.

Now all the Liberals ask is that the same parental authority which kindly, but firmly, ascertains whether a man is or is not liable to pay so much to the State and the parish, and finding him liable does at once proceed to enforce the liability, shall also take care that if his name ought to appear on the list of voters, his name shall appear there without any cost, trouble, or loss of time on his part. Not a very unreasonable demand in the way of reform, most Americans would doubtless say. No; not a very unreasonable demand, but a demand of the utmost importance in this country where whole masses of voters among the poorer classes are disfranchised every year because they have not the time to look after the business of their registration and the opponents of their political party find time enough to organize an opposition to their registration in their absence. The two reforms I have spoken of would give expression for the first time to the real political sentiments of the vast majority of the people of England.

As I write, just after the elections are over, or practically over, there are two opinions among members of the Liberal party—I speak now of genuine Liberals. There are a few men who think that Mr. Gladstone would do wisely to put off Home Rule for a short time and to pass a measure for One Man, One Vote, and another measure for improved registration, and having secured

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these reforms as a preliminary condition then to bring in the Home Rule Bill. Of course, if we had these preliminary reforms passed the Home Rule Bill would be a foregone conclusion. I know that Radicals as advanced as Mr. Labouchere, for example, are in favor of this course of proceeding. Therefore I feel bound to treat the suggestion with all manner of seriousness and all manner of respect. Nevertheless it will not do, and I feel convinced that Mr. Gladstone has no intention of adopting any such course of policy. Home Rule must come on before anything else. Mr. Gladstone lost office for the sake of Home Rule, he has regained office because of Home Rule and he knows that the people of Ireland, and the vast Irish population of the United States and Canada and Australia, look to him to inaugurate his return to power by introducing a measure for the setting up of Home Rule in Ireland. I take it for granted that this is what he will do. On that point I cannot admit into my own mind any manner of doubt. But there is not the slightest reason why, when his ministry gets to actual work, he should not himself introduce a Home Rule scheme on one day, and others of his colleagues introduce a One Man, One Vote bill and a reformed registration bill the same day or the day after. The bills could then follow in each other's steps easily enough, and if Mr. Gladstone should not be able to force his Home Rule Bill through the House of Lords on the very first rush, he might easily secure the passing of the other measures which would make Home Rule, at the next time of its introduction, a matter of certainty and of easy success.

There is another way of doing the work. Mr. Gladstone may bring in a Home Rule bill in the first session of the new Parliament. He has majority enough—quite enough—to carry his bill through the House of Commons. It goes up to the Lords, and the Lords, as I have said, reject it. Then Mr. Gladstone could call another session very early, and bring in the Home Rule Bill again; and meantime the country would be roused to such an agitation against the House of Lords that the peers would feel they must either give in or give out. The peers would feel—must know—that if they were to carry resistance any farther, there would be an uprising of public opinion before which the House of Lords would go down like an Alpine village before an avalanche. The House of Lords, as a political institution, holds on to existence by a very slender thread. We all remember the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

story of the very old lady who talked to Fontenelle, still older, about the kindliness of death in having passed them over for so long a time. "Hush, madame," Fontenelle replied; "don't remind Death—he may only have forgotten us." I should think the saner members of the House of Lords would feel somewhat as Fontenelle felt, and would be inclined to urge that public opinion might not be compelled to remember the existence of the hereditary chamber.

By such a process as this, Home Rule might be carried even without the necessity of waiting for the full operation of such measures as the establishment of the principle of One Man, One Vote and the much-needed reform in the system of registration. But in the meanwhile I hope and believe that the Liberal government, when it has fairly settled itself in office, will introduce all three reforms as nearly as possible side by side. When I say as nearly as possible side by side, I mean that I hope and believe the first place will be given to Home Rule, the next to One Man, One Vote, and the third to a better system of registration. Then if the Lords throw out the Home Rule Bill—or rather, I should say, when the Lords had thrown out the Home Rule Bill—the other measures of reform might be carried. The Lords would hardly venture to reject three great popular measures in one session, and there would be easy work for the Liberals in the following year.

Nothing could be more curious than the kind of talk which has been heard lately among some of the supporters of the Tory government. It has been heard even from the mouths of practical Tory politicians, who ought to know much better. Why, they ask, should Lord Salisbury resign? Why should he regard a vote of no-confidence or a vote of censure passed against him by a majority of forty-two? Forty-two is not a very great majority, as numbers in Parliament now go. Why should he not stick on and refuse to leave office until some definite and practical measure of his is thrown out by the House of Commons? The younger Pitt sat on, supported by his Sovereign, in defiance of many a majority of the House of Commons. So he did; but we have a good deal outgrown the times of the younger Pitt; and the present Sovereign of England is not in the least likely to try to revive the arbitrary days of George the Third. The time when any Sovereign could venture to uphold a defeated ministry against a majority of the House of Commons expired with George the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fourth—or, at all events, with William the Fourth. We may take it for granted that Queen Victoria, who has been the model of a constitutional sovereign, will not listen for one moment to the crazy suggestions which some speakers and writers, who profess to be devoted loyalists, are spontaneously offering to her. Nor do I believe for an instant that Lord Salisbury or Mr. Balfour could be influenced by such preposterous counsel. I am writing in anticipation of events, but I venture thus far to assume the strain of the prophet. There will be no attempt made to set aside by ministerial pertinacity or by royal will the decision of the constituencies of Great Britain and Ireland. Whatever else may happen, that will not happen. There will be every effort made, of course, on the part of the Conservatives, to prevent the Liberal majority from carrying out their purposes of reform, but it will be by side-strokes, and not by a *coup d' état*.

There is one possibility which nobody here seems to be considering, but which yet I venture to think is worthy of consideration. How, if the Tory statesmen were to admit that their Local Government Bill for Ireland, introduced and abandoned last session, had failed to give satisfaction to Parliament and were to undertake to bring in a much wider bill, with an intimation—sent round by whisper and by private interview—that it might be hammered in committee into a genuine measure of Home Rule, which they, the Tories, could easily pass through the House of Lords? The House of Lords would swallow anything coming from a Tory government, and so all trouble would be saved.

Were Disraeli living now, and in any manner of physical strength, this, I have very little doubt, is the way in which he would manage to outflank his opponents. This is exactly what he did, when, having in 1866 defeated Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill by the aid of some secessionist Liberals and turned Mr. Gladstone out of office, he himself in 1867 brought in another reform bill and carried it by the help of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright wanted a good measure of suffrage reform and did not care who carried it as long as it was carried. Mr. Gladstone now wants to see Home Rule carried, and does not, I am sure, care who has the nominal honor of carrying it, if only it is carried. But then, Disraeli has long been dead, and Lord Salisbury is the leader of the Conservative party.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOT IN SOCIETY.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

As NATIONS become civilized, they naturally abrogate the cumbrous ceremonials with which barbarism impedes the machinery of government, and as individuals become cultured and intellectual, they throw off with spontaneous impatience the swaddling bands of formal society. Every community now has a goodly number of these Social Dissenters—men and women who are "not in society," and who are neither pained nor shamed by the fact, but rather avow it with the complaisance of clever people who have found out a fraud.

These Social Dissenters are by no means from the unknown or unimportant classes. They are usually people of distinction, who live well, dress fashionably, pay their bills, are blameless in character, courteous, hospitable, and with no taint of cynicism in their nature; yet they "save themselves" from their fellows, and, without explanations or regrets, refuse to add one more to the hundreds of persons leading a life that has no attractions for them.

If asked for the "why and wherefore" of their conduct they find reasons "plenty as blackberries." They assert that "Society" fills life with imaginary duties; that it permits no ideals, but levels all to the same plane; giving no more regard to the brightest intellect than to the mental tag-rag who fringe its dinner-tables and drawing-rooms; that it forces all the world into the circumference of a gibus-hat; and yet, that its social joys are the real social penalties, and an invitation to a great many entertainment a far worse thing than to be excluded from all them. They ask why they should leave their own occupations and break through their own habits to accept the hours, the cooking, and the friends of others, when all conversation is frowned down by Society which is not so placidly commonplace as to be incapable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of offending any one's prejudices, likes, or dislikes ; where indeed conversation is on such a dead level that it is not necessary to talk at all, only to smile, utter interjections and appear to be amused. Besides these and many other minor counts, they finally declare Society's ethical judgments to be narrow, pharisaical, and often very unjust ; while it accepts constantly conventionalities, in the place of the most important realities.

But as a rule there are few conditions in life which are not many-sided and capable of being defended on every side. And we must first notice that social secessionsts are expecting Society to be what Society never purposes or wishes to be, and that therefore they might as justly complain that a man is a hedger or ditcher when he might be a poet or a preacher. Society never yet set itself to be good or great. It has no higher mission than to promote social pleasure and order, and the qualifications it requires are not piety or intellect, but the ability to dress well, to say a great deal about nothing, to lead a dance, to keep every tittle of the rigid traditional law of uniformities, and in all disputed questions, or doubtful positions, to imitate that truly great and wise man, the Levite, rather than the officious, demonstrative Samaritan.

We must, of course, admit that this is a low moral and intellectual plane, but it is a plane which satisfies the aspirations and capabilities of the majority who tarry there ; and all things in life are not equally happy and justifiable. Looked at in relation to the needs of individual souls, society duties do seem to be utter vanity ; and, of course, we all acknowledge that it is a better thing to be a bishop than a dancing master ; yet if dancing masters are necessary, then one office is as exactly right and moral as the other. And no one is compelled to become a society man or a society woman ; but what a vast number of people would be at a loss how to dress themselves, and what to do with themselves, if Society did not devise their clothing, their habits, their pleasures, and the most trivial details of their lives for them !

Nor is this social dictation altogether a bad thing for the world. We have only to remember the number of silly, ignorant, selfish, self-willed people loose and at leisure, and imagine them going up and down and to and fro in the world with their own natural tastes and tempers, and indulging these without regard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the feelings and rights of others, and we should quickly understand that there are cases in which individuality would cease to be the charming and desirable thing it is supposed to be. And then we should cordially admit that it is an excellent thing for Fashionable Society to take charge of this element and manage it with the tight rein of its unwritten but inexorable laws.

For, as a rule, if people submit to this kind of chaperonage, it is evidence that they require it—that they are of that large majority of average men and women who are never confounded by the great enigmas of life nor ambitious of its highest duties, nor yet capable of its widest liberties; though it is a fact that many of the cleverer sort make of the very limitations of Society an effectual freedom, it being a truth, to those willing to take this kind of truth, that much may be gained by giving up a little.

For if a man or woman dress rigorously in the mode, pay the social mint, anise, and cummin, speak in the regulation social shibboleth, then he or she may take a considerable latitude. A man may be soured to the core of his nature, cynical and sensual, but it is not the business of Society to notice these things, if only he observe the decencies of life, wear the regulation costume, and show himself occasionally in the proper drawing-rooms; and a woman who transacts her Sunday church exercise regularly, and observes all the greater or lesser laws of Society, is not expected to render an account of her private life to the respectable world, whose business is only with the appearing side of things.

This position brings us to the ethics of Society, which are constantly affirmed to be unjust, unmerciful, and not always virtuous. Society, however, never pretends to be a teacher of morality. That is the office of religion and of law. Society contents itself with making scapegoats of such of its members as outrage public opinion by being found out. An obvious example is the case of any woman who is known to have broken the law of purity. Religion forgives her. Society never forgives her. It forgives her partner in sin, without even requiring that he shall sin no more; but for her it has no pardon and no palliation. For socially it is not a question of relative guilt; it is one entirely of social considerations; and Society's verdict is in accordance therewith. There is a redundancy of women; they are less important than men; they are more easily hit, and they are not as able to strike back; therefore, through the woman, Society makes testimony

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the fact that it wishes to recognize the moralities it has been powerless to enforce. It cannot always be virtuous, but it can occasionally sacrifice a young kid, or send some poor scapegoat into the wilderness of its oblivion. This, truly, is not the code of the Holy Scriptures; but then the social code is not divine, it is human. And it is perhaps well that the two differ, else the lower might debase the higher; and it is better for humanity to have some ideally high standard, though they never reach it, than one so low that it may be reached every day.

Still, as a rule, the Decalogue stands as a finality, and the morals of society have been gradually uplifted by this fact. Many can remember a time when it was rather fashionable for vice to swagger in the face of virtue; now the social law demands that vice wear a mask and a robe of some decent kind. Whatever broad road of sin is followed by its members privately, in public all Society's ways must be ways of decency, and all its paths must be proper; and those who defy this command are very apt to be scapegoated as examples of social morality.

Of course, every one is aware that the scapegoats of society are seldom any worse than the other goats, and that they are often unjustly chosen. Perhaps they have only offended against some prejudice or deeply-rooted custom, and have to take the consequences. But that contingency is in the contract; for Society has the right and the obligation of self-defence, and must protect itself against whatever it conceives to be injurious to itself. To be sure, this is very sad, but not sadder than many things in life; and as the Scriptures teach us that one sinner has no right to complain of the favor shown another sinner, we must infer a fundamental justice in the position, whose roots may be behind this existence. One comfort remains to these unfortunates—they may reflect that they have, and always have had, many companions; and that after awhile they will not feel nearly as unhappy as they expected to feel; nay, they may even come to consider their banishment as an enfranchisement.

With an instinctive justice Society pounces upon literary offenders, because it apprehends literary immorality to be a powerful incentive to social immorality. Hence the writers of uncleanly literature are scapegoated—and very properly so—with little ceremony. For Society may tolerate a man who breaks all the ten commandments in private; but it will not suffer the man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who describes the breaking of them in a book. Society may hold it no social crime to covet all a neighbor's possessions, but it does hold it a crime for a novelist to covet an imaginary wife. And there is a positive and evident justice in this estimate. For it is the object of Society to keep respectable on the surface, therefore it will not tolerate those who seek below its surface for the sins it does not indorse publicly. So then, if an author use his imagination to penetrate social depths, and there beget all kinds of murders and adulteries and human monsters, he deserves the social ostracism that is sure to be given him. Society then—though it acts from lower and more partial aims than the Decalogue—*is a moral and conserving agent; and a law unto many* who would heed no other law half so well.

We must thank Society also for preventing much offensive, ill-conditioned personality. It teaches the young and foolish some decent self-restraint. Let us imagine girls of sixteen disdaining the usual dress and usual forms of civility, and inflicting on the world their own crude, undisciplined individuality; yawning in the faces of all who bored them, admiring with the *naiveté* of young savages, "saying just what they thought,"—that is, pleasing themselves without any consideration for others—and we shall be ready to admit the superiority of the Society girls who have been taught to suppress their spontaneity, who have themselves well in hand, who give themselves to their company, and play their part graciously and without a trip—the girls who understand *les convenances* and obey them, who do not "take up causes" or make their philanthropy conspicuous, who have no extreme views, whose passions are small, whose prejudices are mild and lady-like, and who can pay court to the fortunate or shrink from the unfortnnate with an equally charming frankness.

For we must consider that as yet the people capable of dwelling alone with their own souls, and with the immortal part of other souls, are in the minority. The majority abhor solitude; they find anything better than their own company. To think! to read! to be alone! These three things are intolerable to people who love the world and the fashion thereof. And if it gives any men or women satisfaction to dress, to eat, to talk, and to amuse themselves precisely as a crowd of other people dress, eat, talk, and amuse themselves; if they prefer to merge their own natures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and tastes and lives in the general mass of Society; to turn night into day; to sit long hours over a single meal; to dress half a dozen times in twenty-four hours; to make penitential drives in the park and spin round half the night in a temperature of ninety degrees; to be tyrannized over by a "set" in the world, and by a crowd of lazy, impudent servants in their homes—if they like this kind of thing, then Society is the kind of thing they will like.

And surely common justice demands that each person be permitted to seek happiness in the form he or she thinks most satisfactory, whether it be in the union and sympathy of a crowd, or in the peace of an individual friendship with nature and books. For in respect that society is what it is, it is a very good life; but in respect that it is not more spiritual and intellectual, it is a very poor life. And yet, perhaps, some power intrinsically better could be better done without.

AMELIA E. BARR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLAIN TALK ON THE DRAMA.

BY RICHARD MANSFIELD.

THERE is little or no doubt that the ancient order of things has been relegated to a back-shelf in an obscure corner, where none but antiquarians, bookworms, and historians will care to meddle with it. The man who attempts to play "Faust" or "Macbeth" or "Hamlet," *tout simplement*, without all the accessories which accompany, say, a Drury Lane pantomime, will be very drearily left alone.

Strong and sincere acting, from the mind and from the heart, simple and true, honest and earnest, goes by unnoticed. We must have something eccentric. Out of the Japanese craze, the æsthetic craze, the craze for the quaint and the radically hideous, were born some strange things, and the shades of Edmund Kean and of Garrick shrank back into dark corners.

The actor rarely now depends upon his *acting*. He must be a diplomat and a courtier too; he must placate a hundred people who write and thousands who entertain; he must be a thing to be gaped at and wondered at; he must loll and pose in drawing-rooms, and be a snob and a sycophant, or he is very likely to fail. His speech must be different to that of any earthly human being, and far from holding the mirror up to nature, he must, if he hold up any mirror at all, make it like unto our familiar nursery tea-pot, in which we saw our little forms and faces strangely and marvellously spread out and distorted. The extravagant—the absurdly extravagant—productions (as they are named) have frightened away all comers. The young and ambitious actor dare not, as of old, launch into Shakespeare, unless he have some thirty-five thousand dollars to lose in one venture; and what young man has?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The critics have been the same in all times ; they have always found fault, it 's their privilege and their business. Read the reviews of Kean's *Richard III.* and see how harshly they treated him; and is any man great until he is dead or as good, or as bad, as dead ? But *the people* in the olden times *came,—the people* ; they crowded the house and they crowded the stage, and the man who stirred them and thrilled them was a hero. To-day he is a monster to be avoided, and the penny shows hold all his former enthusiastic patrons. To-day, as we approach the serious portion of a play, when the tears are likely to follow and the heart to beat a little faster, when there may be a thrill of horror or a gasp of agony, we men rise from our seats and go complaining to our clubs. And, therefore, what is the actor to act, and who is the actor who preeminently is likely to succeed financially ? The man at whom we can laugh, or scoff, or who is so small, so eccentric and so petty in his efforts that he never stirs, and is only " clever " where he should be great ? And what great and successful examples are held up to young actors to follow ? What does he see succeed and what will he not, therefore, consider right ! That which every man, with eyes in his head, knows to be wrong. And no reliance at home upon ourselves, but a great snobbish homage to everything from abroad !

This a country, too, that has brought forth Booths and Charlotte Cushman, and fostered Fechters and Forrests, and a list of giant names ! Have not the greatest actors the American stage has seen been thoroughly well snubbed abroad ? In France ignored totally, and in England dined and fêted, but carefully and particularly put away and disabled and lopped off, and marched out of the land with great pretence of hospitality, and, sent home, with a burning heart, a shame-flushed face and an empty, empty, empty purse, while the foreigner sat back and smiled at his clever treachery ? And it's true, true every word of it.

Do not American correspondents eternally cable to domestic newspapers long stories of the wonders achieved by this man and that man over there, who sits up in his holiday pride, and blinks his little eyes, and says: "See how they gape at me over there ; write of me constantly, my American friend. I'm of great interest to your people, who have nothing of their own, and presently I will come to them, and teach them some of my

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art, and take their dollars, of which I gain but few in my own land." And when he enters is he a whit better than, or half as sincere as, was your Booth or your Barrett or your Davenport or your Gilbert or your Wallack?

You may turn the foreign sheets inside out, topsy turvy, or what you will, and find no one word concerning American art. Pshaw! American art! I've seen that quick, covert smile when some man spoke of "American art" at the Garrick Club, in Garrick street, Covent Garden, and I've heard the greatest British critic shriek: "Your American drama is damned vulgar." Ye gods and little fishes! Vulgar! Think of the vulgarities of the plum-duff drama and the importations we 've wondered at. Is this bitter? Not a jot. It 's true, that 's all.

Your American critic will berate you soundly with his pen, but he won't sell you for a dollar, and cannot be bought, and veritably I believe he 'll defend the very one he chastises, if another attack him. This is no longer a colony, but a great land, where our art shall be so fine that those who come to us may learn and bow and copy, and not pat us on the head any longer, and strut around and patronize, and sigh great sighs of happy contentment when the time comes for departure with pockets full of our gold. And wherefore do you pay them three heavy dollars for a seat from which to look at them, when upon those of your own country, who bring you as much and more, you will bestow with reluctance only half that gracious sum? Pray tell me this!

Why has no actor in your chief cities a stage of his own? Why do theatres belong to managers, business men who have acquired fortunes in this or that trade and now let them out, like bath-houses at great and stultifying rates to poor itinerant players? Have you no rich men—no men who will build and rent at a fair rental? No friends such as English art has in London? What a privilege to create great characters and play great plays for the suffering of paying three thousand dollars a week to a stranger? What is this trade in actors and plays, this speculating and gambling, this slave market, this crushing down of the one that rises, this merchanting in actors and actresses, and the smiling octopus that sucks all things dry, this playing *down* to *people*, instead of playing *up* to art, and dragging the people after? You have great managers, such men as are Augustin Daly and Palmer and Frohman, but you may have actors, too, in their own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

houses, and make all things even, not all up on one side, which is dangerous, at a glance, to any good ship, and most of all to the furtherance of the voyage we are on.

Let the managers have their theatres and the actors theirs, and the rivalry will benefit the Drama. Let the poet realize some of his dreams, the actor and the painter, and come and look at them. They may be strange, these dreams, and weird and odd and not successful, but there will be something gained and something new, and not the same eternal drumming out of $A^2 + B^2 \times A^2 + B^2$ and its monotonous result. We want poetry upon the stage. Poetry! The stage is for Poetry. It is not for merchants and mechanics and penny-a-liners. It is for Poetry! I would stand upon this summit and cry out that this is a stupid business day, from the rising of the sun to the setting of it; that young men in short hose talk money, that middle-aged and old, and girls and women, and that we are dying of it and suffocating, that books are full of it, and that the air is laden with it, and that we go about with itching palms and hooked fingers; that all the world would be better for Poetry; that the heart would beat more gently, and the mind be more sweetly oiled, and the soul soar higher for the contemplation of Poetry.

And that is what the stage is for. Neither for rot, nor for drivel, nor for filth, nor for tanks of water, nor for ancient dames in tights, nor for cheap sentiment, nor for catchpennies, but for Poetry. And not incomprehensible either, for the "Morte d' Arthur" and all the "tales of the Round Table" are poetry, and "Hiawatha," and a thousand Indian legends there are that are poetry; and so is "Lucile" of poor dead Meredith, and all the things some of us, lying on the grass, with our faces to the sky-lark, dream of on a summer day or on a moonlit evening—those things that come to us with a whiff of the balsam pine or the break of the sea on the beach, or the touch of a soft hand or the discovery of a withered flower. It is in us always and it will crop out in the most hardened of us, and where we should always see it, and where it should forever awaken all that was born good and beautiful in us, is upon the stage.

The stage should not be for temptation, from the deliverance of which we pray in the morning and which we court in the evening; it should not be for the idiotic laugh and the imbecile applause; it is not for the drunkard and the wanton; it is not to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be shrieked at to-day and to be ashamed of tomorrow ; it is not for gymnastics ; it is for the gracious, the graceful, the thoughtful, the gentle ; it is to send us home with better thoughts and better feelings, with a lesson learnt by example and with food for pleasant reflection. It is for wholesome mirth or for such stirring tragedy as will fire us to nobler deeds, or for such potent example as will sicken us of evil doing. That is the stage as I understand it and as I would strive for it.

Let not the YOUTHFUL critic, from whose responsible pen depends the weighty power of a mighty journal, clip off the head of every bud that thrusts its head above the rotting leaves. Who knows how beautiful and how radiant it might grow to be? A word written lasts longer than a word spoken, and what is printed is sometimes read, and what is read cannot be blotted out always. Separate the man from his art. If you dislike the man, you have no right to condemn his art. Your sense of honor must make you just. Personal abuse is not criticism. Never. It is unworthy of any great journal, and it degrades the country in which the journal is published. Criticise with dignity, if you criticise at all. What is worthy of criticism is worthy of respect. If it is absolutely unworthy, treat it as you treat the silliness of a strange child, with silence. Reflect when you say bitter and biting things how you would bear these words addressed to you. Think, before you tear down, how long it took to build up—what work, what suffering, what expenditure of hard-earned means. Remember that you are not writing to show the world how clever you are, but how just you can be. Recollect that your lightest word weighs heavy with the object of your praise or censure.

Do not fail to consider that the actor who works with his nerves, who has travelled much and suffered much, is an irritable being, dyspeptic perchance, and that bitter and hostile criticism is a cruel dose after a dish of enervating toil. Know that the actor is a child in his relations with the world and lives in a cloudland of his own. His one desire is to please ; when he fails he is angry with himself, angry with all the world about him. He has striven, and he generally knows in his heart, much better than you can tell him, that he has failed. Take the OBJECT of his attainment into consideration. If his art has in it the germ of goodness, or of greatness, pray foster and cherish it, and be kind,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and gracious, and gentle always. If you are harsh with him and unduly bitter or personal, do not blame him if he retaliates—he is probably only human ; and be man enough not to bear rancor if he gives you a Roland for your Oliver, since you have brought it upon yourself, and the "Freedom of the press" does not mean the privilege, with immunity, of abuse.

The bane of the American drama is the cheap theatre ; and if my protest can be heard and, being heard, be deemed a rightful protest, all men will stay away from it, henceforth forever. It counts for nothing that you can sit downstairs for fifty cents. One would rather eat a delicious dinner in a kitchen than masticate a vile mixture in a palace. Therefore it is better to sit upstairs and see an actor attempt good things than sit downstairs and see him succeed in doing bad. The success of the cheap theatre means the extinction of the gallery patronage. They are nearly gone now, those faces all aglow, those shirt-sleeved arms, those thunderous bursts of rapturous applause and the familiar earnest word of encouragement ; who so quick to recognize the actor's finest points, who so quick to laugh, so quick to weep, and who first spread the news of some great moment in an actor's life ? They are gone now, those honest faces ; we look for them in vain. The practical loss lies in the fact that in these days of heavy expenses the actor-manager must find his house all-over-full if he is to earn a profit.

It may be hoped that the American people is by now weary of what has been termed "Farce Comedy"—a conglomeration of various variety entertainments, formerly not under the head of our art, but indigenous to the music halls. It is to be hoped that it desires the poetic drama ; the gracious, gentle, and wholesome comedy ; the genuine burlesque, which, in the garb of witty satire, will teach many a healthy lesson ; the music of the ideal opera ; and it may be hoped too that each of these may be labelled and put away in its special box and not confused and mixed up.

It may be hoped that the American people will hospitably receive and welcome all that is good and great coming from abroad, such men as are indeed Irving, Salvini, Coquelin and the earnest Willard, and such a woman as the incomparable Helen Terry, or such as Hading is and Ristori was, but—those who live across the sea MUST equally recognize and welcome those who come to them with the indorsement of the American press and the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people; and that recognition *shall not, must not* be earned at the cost of great wealth and wire-pulling and great sycophancy, but it must be a ready, hearty and open-armed recognition, at once spontaneous, as is ours, with no sneering at the American tongue and American manner,—since we sneer not at the foreign—and it may be hoped, with some certainty of realization, that the American drama will soon stand foremost in the drama of the nations.

RICHARD MANSFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REMINISCENCES OF JOHN BRIGHT.

BY HIS NEPHEW, CHARLES McLAREN.

A SIMPLE stone marks the resting place of John Bright in the Friends' Burial Ground in Rochdale. For well-nigh a century he, and his Quaker parents before him, had worshipped in the old-world meeting-house, whose plain and spotless interior is less part of the busy Rochdale of to-day, with its dark chimneys and countless shuttles, than of the clean, quiet old town on the fringe of the moors forming the breezy borderland between Lancashire and Yorkshire eighty years ago.

Tim Bobbin and Edwin Waugh have made the rich, quaint tongue of that countryside live in our literature. Wit, common sense, and outspoken fearlessness characterize those who speak it. Here, as in most English towns before the railway age, lived apart a smaller Quaker community, with the Puritan tradition undefiled, and from it sprang the foremost Liberal of these times. Just as the key to Mr. Gladstone's mental history is to be found in his Eton and Oxford life, so John Bright's inherited impulse to battle against greed and oppression in Church and State was intensified by these surroundings of his early years. They colored his nature as man and politician. He was trained from the first to political thought and effort. His father used to read the Manchester *Guardian* aloud on Saturday evenings to the children, while he talked of the days of Pitt and Castlereagh, and told them of the Luddites and of political persecutions that filled their hearts with hatred of Tory power and Tory principles. So, at a time when Bamford, Carlisle and "Orator" Hunt were already to the front in the struggle for Parliamentary Reform, the first public act of John Bright's childhood was to chalk "Hunt forever!" on the steps of his father's cotton mill. His literary tastes were formed and amply satisfied in the Quaker home life at Green Bank, where books filled the place of more frivolous amusements in the outside world. For the rest, his education was found in riding, fishing, cricket, and so forth, in close association with the sons of his father's workpeople. And thus he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grew up a practical, straightforward man, knowing and caring for his countrymen; an Englishman on the side of the English.

Among the earliest public lecturers in Birmingham was James Silk Buckingham, the founder of the original *Athenæum* paper. In moving a vote of thanks to him after a lecture in Rochdale, John Bright made his first speech. It is written in full, artificially constructed and polished, after the manner of a young literary hand. He subsequently wrote and delivered some lectures himself describing a journey to the Holy Land. Fluency and power he gained by speaking at political gatherings in the town, but this first effort is interesting as the key to the method of his oratory. While much of his language was coined on the spot from a mind familiar with every great English writer of verse or of prose, his arguments and illustrations, together with his perorations and many of his more striking passages, were carefully composed and committed to paper in the form of elaborate notes. He studied the form as well as the subject of his speeches; and his adherence from the first to good literary models kept him from degenerating into the merely fluent speaker.

Even his boyish letters were works of art. They breathed a tender sentiment which time never destroyed, and which gave a singular charm to his character. His devotion to his sister's and his childhood's home, where sweetbriar and roses crept around the door, and pears and cherries climbed over the plain red walls, helped to create in his mind that sense of the beauty and dignity of domestic life which runs through his speeches and touches every English heart. Shortly before his betrothal he wrote in French to his favorite sister, Priscilla:

> "Our dispositions seem very much the same. The things you like I like, and what gives you no pleasure has no attraction for me. Still it is almost certain that this happy union between us will be severed; perhaps you will have another companion in your journeys, and I shall be forced to seek elsewhere a partner of my joys and sorrows. But in every situation in which we may be placed we shall retain the same feelings for each other that we held in our youth; and the love which exists now will forever remain to sweeten the misfortunes which may await us."

His letters to her breathe the warmest affection down to the close of his life, and though on many social and political questions he and his sisters and brothers held opposite opinions, those differences never interfered with their regard for one another.

It was not until his first wife's death in 1841 that John Bright

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plunged into the struggle against the protective Corn Laws, which were starving trade and pauperizing the country in the interests of the land-owning aristocracy. Richard Cobden then urged him to organize with himself a campaign against the tax on bread. Thus began the intimate friendships between the two men to which John Bright owed much, but to which Richard Cobden owed even more. In two years John Bright's name was in every English mouth. He became the most powerful speaker of the Anti-Corn-Law League. After a free trade campaign, which culminated in the historic demonstration at Drury Lane Theatre, he was returned in 1843 in the Radical interest for Durham City. It was a rare thing in those days of restricted franchises for a man of the middle class to enter the House of Commons. The ringers and wardens of Rochdale Parish would have rung the bells, but for the threats of the Tory Vicar. Great, however, were the rejoicings of the people, and the man who came racing over the meadows to Green Bank got a guinea for his news. A few days later the father received from Sir Thomas Potter, a Manchester merchant, this letter.

"I beg most sincerely to congratulate you on the success of your talented son at Durham. When he returned from a tour on the Continent, which by your liberality he was of course enabled to take, I heard (with admiration) of the exertions he made in communicating the information he obtained to his young friends at home, and before I had the pleasure of knowing him. This, with other circumstances, made a most favorable impression on my mind, and I have frequently inquired why he was not brought forward for his native town. Mr. Brooks and myself have determined that he shall have it in his power on entering the House of Commons to state that his election has not cost him a shilling, in which plan we are not afraid of our friends' support. If there is any amount your son is out of pocket please to place it to the account of Potter & Morris, and write me by return of post."

The son of this gentleman, by a curious coincidence the Palmerstonian candidate for Manchester at the general election of 1856, defeated John Bright himself, whose popularity had waned for a time through uncompromising opposition to the Crimean and Chinese wars. But during the forty years John Bright sat in Parliament for Durham, Manchester, and Birmingham in succession, the precedent created by Sir Thomas Potter was followed by other friends, and he never had to pay any election expenses.

Many of his old free trade friends deserted John Bright when he called for further reform of the electoral system. If he was known as "the first Tribune of the British people," it was because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he battled almost unaided during a whole generation for the people's emancipation from the aristocratic juntos of Whig and Tory landowners who, even after the first Reform Act of 1832, governed the country by a Parliament in which the real manhood of the country was unrepresented. It was due to his persistent agitation that the right of voting for members of Parliament was twice extended, until every male householder in the three Kingdoms obtained a voice in the National government. He helped them, too, in winning the right to vote by ballot, in spite of the alarm cry in vogue before America became the fashion in Pall Mall, that he was "Americanizing our institutions." Alone he vindicated in Parliament the cause of the United States in its struggle with "that great conspiracy against human nature," to use his own words, of the Rebel South. It was his giant influence which kept the nation right on that question; and they and he together extinguished the Whig and Tory plots against the Union to which the Palmerston cabinet, with the sanction of Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone, were lending a willing ear. No Englishman had a truer love for the great English Republic across the Atlantic than he. In concluding his speech at the Rochdale meeting held to thank the merchants of New York for their relief of the suffering people of the Lancashire cotton districts, he said: "From the very outburst of this great convulsion I have had but one hope and one faith, and it is this—that the result of this stupendous strife may be to make freedom the heritage forever of a whole continent, and that the grandeur and the prosperity of the American Union may never be impaired."

In his library at One Ash, among the books and pictures that tell the history of his political life, hang portraits of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and the autographs, framed, of both these great Presidents. A bust of John Bright alone with John Hampden among British statesmen, placed by Abraham Lincoln in the White House at Washington, remains today a tribute to his championship of the American cause. John Bright seldom made an unsuccessful speech. Like other artists, however, he was nervous, anxious and irritable until his work was done. When his speech was over, he was as happy and sympathetic as a child. If it was a speech in the House of Commons he would retire to the members' smoking room, or stand with his back to the fire in the division lobby, and, surrounded by a group

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of parliamentary friends run over the debate with trenchant humor. If it was a public meeting, he would fall into his host's easy chair with a cigar, and talk far into the night on a thousand trivial topics to which his language lent a thousand charms. Dogs, parrots, innkeepers, Scotch ministers, minor poets, royalties, American visitors, sayings and doings of the political world, Highland gamekeepers, great men and small men, all interested him. No one who has ever felt it will forget the fascination of that monologue which seemed to gather force and interest as the hours went by. All the genius of his matchless eloquence was there, directed to the kindly as well as the serious side of life. As in his talk, so in his speeches, humor succeeded pathos, and indignation alternated with satire. The strength and purity of his language were in harmony with the rich vibration of his voice, and any lack of gesture was atoned for by the noble earnestness of his presence and the dramatic power of his mouth and eye. He touched his subject with a broad hand: "Gladstone," he said, "goes coasting along, turning up every creek and exploring it to its source before he can proceed on his way; but I have no talent for detail. I hold my course from headland to headland through the great seas." Many of his happiest illustrations were the homeliest. One which delighted the political world at the time was pointed at Horsman and Lowe, who started the Whig seccession that ultimately defeated the Reform Bill of 1866. "This party of two reminds me of the Scotch terrier which was so covered with hair that you could not tell which was the head and which was the tail of it." "This came into my head," he related afterwards, "as I was walking down to the house. I thought first that it would do, and then that it would not do, and I determined not to use it. And while I was speaking it suddenly turned up in my mind, and it was a great success."

Poetry was an abiding pleasure with him. His favorite authors were Milton, Whittier, Longfellow, and Byron, and he loved to read their works aloud evening after evening to his children. He explored the by-paths of literature for undiscovered poets. His memory was stored with poems, which he would repeat as he drove along in his quiet journeys with his sisters or children through Scotland or Italy. "There is nothing," he used to say, "which gives so much pleasure as poetry, except little children."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now and then he would jot down a verse or an epigram of his own in the album of a hotel. In the visitors' book of a little Highland inn near Inverness he condensed his views on the land question in these words:

> "In Highland glens 't is far too oft observed
> That men are chased away, and game preserved;
> Glen Urquhart is to me a lovelier glen,
> Here grouse and deer have not supplanted men."

He interested himself in restoring to Michael Bruce, the poor Scotch schoolmaster and poet, the authorship of the exquisite lines to "The Cuckoo," which, after Bruce's death, had been pilfered by Logan and published under the latter's name; and he sealed his belief in the task by a pilgrimage to Bruce's grave. He loved Scotland, and, in a sort of way, the Scotch. He had a little family of Scotch terriers of whom he was very fond. But a dog rarely came near him that he did not caress. Salmon fishing became his favorite, and, latterly, his only outdoor occupation, and he was a frequent and welcome guest on the best reaches of the Tweed and the Tay. "But I do n't always like Scotch theology," he said once; "it's too full of the gridiron." He had more sympathy with Robert Burns and the Scotch poets. His own religion was found in the Sermon on the Mount. Creeds and formularies were not to his liking. At a certain dinner he turned from a Highland minister of opposite political opinions and assertive tongue with the remark: "It's odd that a man who knows so little about this world can tell us so much about the next."

In matters political, however, he never indulged in toleration. The least agreeable part of his nature was a Johnsonian brusqueness, which the presence of any opposition and above all of Toryism in the company usually brought to the front. Toryism had broken lances with him for the best part of his life, not always in chivalrous fashion, but ever with disastrous results to the Tories. In 1880, when that party were invoking the wrath of heaven upon those who supported Mr. Bradlaugh, the Radical free-thinking member for Northampton, in claiming the right to take his seat in Parliament, John Bright remarked: "It is not his atheism that those fellows are afraid of. It is the practical Christianity of his politics." But he usually reserved his serious displeasure for the Whigs "who ought to know better." Tories

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were merely "fools," and could be summarily disposed of. Disraeli, however, who boasted that politics were the best form of gambling he knew, was taken by John Bright at his own estimate. "Dizzy did not dislike me," he once said with a twinkle in his eye, "for I never stood in his way." Palmerston, "that old sinner," as he called him, was a far more heinous offender. The bully of Europe, the sham Liberal and the cynical foe of reform, lost no opportunity of sneering at John Bright, and in his turn received no quarter from the apostle of non-intervention and the friend of the unenfranchised masses.

As his wife cared little for London life, John Bright always lived during the Parliamentary session in bachelor quarters, and probably never gave a dinner party in his life. For many years before his death he occupied a set of rooms in Piccadilly facing the Green Park. Here he breakfasted and smoked his morning cigar, and at ten o'clock he was accessible to every one who chose to call. He received his visitors in a grey dressing-gown. All were welcome; and it may be safely said that his kindest smile was for the struggling author, or for the American who sought him as the friend of America, often without other introduction than his nationality. Even on the streets of London his well-known face invited recognition; and many a time his hand was shaken by unknown travelers from the United States, men or women, whose names he never knew and whom he never saw again.

Whilst he held Cabinet office he transacted with his secretary, when his levee was over, his daily business as Minister of the Crown; after which he would sit down at a little old-fashioned desk and write his private letters, twenty or thirty every day. These were often penned on half sheets of paper, torn from the notes of his too numerous correspondents; but even in this scrappy guise they were models of neatness, written in a small and delicate hand. He never used an amanuensis or left the letter of a stranger unanswered. So punctilious was he in this courtesy that he not only thanked the people who forwarded him presentation copies of their books, but conscientiously read every volume. He even recognized the needs of autograph hunters, and he used to send them a few favorite hints of Whittier's with his signature below.

The portrait in the Reform Club by Frank Holl shows only the fighting side of the statesman whose social qualities found

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there for over forty years their most congenial surroundings. A large part of John Bright's idle hours in London were spent in the old club house in Pall Mall so intimately associated with the history of English Liberalism. Though he was an habitual diner-out, he made but a pretence of the evening meal. After glancing over the day's papers at the club, he liked to make a dinner there in the afternoon, after which he would stroll from table to table in casual talk, and finally to the smoking-room or billiard-room, always surrounded by a knot of friends. Thus the day passed until it was time to go down to the House of Commons or out to dinner. Billiards was the only game he cared for, and if he never made a good player it was not for want of practice. By an unwritten but sacred law, the "little billiard-room" at the Reform Club was as absolutely at his disposal as was the corner seat on the third bench below the gangway in the House of Commons—a place in which, as all the world knows, no seat is specially appropriated to any member except, in some rare instance, by the tacit assent of the party to which he belongs.

As his influence in the country grew to be unquestioned, he became everywhere a privileged person. The Queen waived in favor of his Quaker principles the rigor of State etiquette. He had always shielded her name in political controversy, once from Tory attacks in her younger days, and also, as it happened once, from his own friends. Consequently, he was well received at Windsor; and when his relations with the Queen had become personal, he used to speak of her with peculiar respect. She was in his eyes "the most absolutely truthful and straightforward person he had ever met." In short, the man who for half a lifetime had been hated as a Jacobin by the self-styled respectable classes, and malignantly reviled by the *Times* and every scurrilous Tory print which represented their views, suddenly found his opinions treated with universal respect. And by a singular fate, he who had created the Liberal party of to day, and placed it in Mr. Gladstone's leadership, was the man who of all others wrecked that party and its leader at the hustings by a single speech on Home Rule addressed to his constituents at Birmingham on the eve of the polls of 1886. That act was the closing out of his own history. His friendship for Mr. Gladstone was over, and he refused to meet his former ally on any pretext of smoothing over their differences on public affairs. As the political tide flowed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

past his own moorings he cared less for actual life; but to the last he never abated the vigor of his invective against men or measures he disliked.

"There is nothing to tell in my life," he used to say to those who talked to him of a biography. "My speeches are my life." And in the copy of his published speeches which he gave to his sister Priscilla McLaren, he wrote the words "my political sermons." His judgment was true enough. No man ever achieved greater success in directing the public opinion and legislation of the nation. But ambition, wealth and social influence had no share in this. It was due to the power of his oratory, and this power depended, not merely on the classical perfection of his style, but on the religious earnestness of his motives, and the personality of the man himself. He was never spoilt by success. The Sunday after one of his most famous speeches in the House of Commons, on the administration of India, in which he first insisted on rational principles of government for the 250,000,000 inhabitants of that Empire, he took his seat as doorkeeper on a back bench of the Friends' Meeting House in his native town, as his name happened to fall in rotation for the duty. He lived simply and without ostentation in the house he had built before his first marriage, keeping the early hours of a country life. He died as he had lived, caressed by the little dog that had been his favorite, surrounded by children whom he loved, and with the consolation of a people's sympathy conveyed to him not alone by the Head of the Nation, but by tokens from the humblest homes. In a passage of perfect eloquence he left to the world his own story:

"I am not," said he in the House of Commons during the Crimean War, "nor did I ever pretend to be, a statesman; and that character is so tainted and equivocal in our day that I am not sure that a pure and honorable ambition would aspire to it. I have not enjoyed for thirty years, like those noble Lords, the honors and emoluments of office. I have not set my sails to every passing breeze. I am a plain and simple citizen, sent here by one of the foremost constituencies of the Empire, representing feebly, perhaps, but honestly, I dare aver, the opinions of very many, and the true interests of all those who have sent me here. Let it not be said that I am alone in my condemnation of this war, and of this incapable and guilty administration. And, even if I were alone, if mine were a solitary voice, raised amid the din of arms and the clamors of a venal press, I should have the consolation I have to-night—and which I trust will be mine to the last moment of my existence—the priceless consolation that no word of mine has tended to promote the squandering of my country's treasure or the spilling of one drop of my country's blood."

CHARLES MCLAREN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GARZA RAID AND ITS LESSONS.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER OF FINANCE.

THE so-called Garza revolution against the government of Mexico, organized on the frontier of the United States, in September, 1891, is an incident furnishing lessons which I think should be taken advantage of, and to call public attention to them is my object and my apology in penning these lines.

It is well known that, as a general rule, the least desirable elements of two bordering countries collect on their frontiers. Smugglers, cattle thieves, fugitives from justice, people compelled to leave their country for their country's good, but who usually attribute their flight to political motives, and other persons under more or less similar circumstances, meet on the frontier, and they are ever ready to undertake any kind of enterprise, no matter how illegal it may be. On the border-line between Mexico and the United States, and particularly on that part of the frontier embraced in the State of Texas, these persons are not an exception to that rule. The inhabitants of that section are largely of Mexican origin, who have never amalgamated with their neighbors of that country, many of them ignorant of the English language and having very little in common with the rest of the inhabitants. Under these circumstances they are peculiarly susceptible to pernicious influences, and therefore only too ready to take part in disturbances of the peace. These people are generally ignorant, few being able to read and write, and they are easily influenced by unscrupulous members of their own race, who can appeal to them in their native tongue. When adventurers pose before them as victims of the tyranny of the existing home government, and know how to work upon their feelings, making them believe that they are coöperators in a legitimate, and even laudable, as well as remunerative, undertaking, they readily elicit their sympathies and support.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some natives of the Mexican states bordering on the United States, who for some reason have been forced to leave their country (and it is possible that among them may be some who in good faith might be considered political emigrants, and who may even be influenced by patriotic sentiments, although these, if any, are few in number), establish themselves in the frontier settlements of Texas because they entertain the illusion that they can materially contribute to the overthrow of the government, of which they have declared themselves the enemies, and which they believe persecutes them. They think that such an overthrow will not be long delayed, and that they may at any time be called back to their homes. Hence they wish to be as near as possible to what they think will be within a short time the theatre of their services and activity.

In support of these assertions I will cite the opinions of persons who are fully competent to speak on the subject, and who are well acquainted with the situation on the frontier. Captain George F. Chase, Third United States Cavalry, who has served some time on the frontier, and who commanded the troops in pursuit of Garza's bands, in an official report made to the headquarters of the Military Department of Texas, which was transmitted by General Stanley to the Department of War, and of which General Schofield furnished extracts which were published by the newspapers of the country, in speaking of the Mexican inhabitants of the Texas frontier says :

"We are serving among people who hate and despise any form of government other than revolutionary. Yet they take pride in being citizens of Mexico. Still the government of Mexico is not satisfactory to them, and they are now endeavoring to overthrow it and put their own people in power with the fortunes they have accumulated on our side of the Rio Grande."

In his report, forwarding that of Captain Chase to the Department of War, General Stanley in referring to this subject, says :

"It must be remembered that a very large percentage of the population along the Texas border is made up of escaped convicts and murderers from Mexico, and of Mexican citizens who have no regard for law and order, and who readily join in any excitement in opposition to government authority. A singular feature of the situation is that the rich Mexicans who own and control large ranches in Southern Texas, and claim every protection of the American government, give their influence and furnish means to support any measure against our government or that of Mexico."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still more explicit is the opinion of the Hon. Thomas Ryan, United States Minister to Mexico, as he expressed it in the Chicago *Evening News* of March 11, 1892. It reads:

"The fact that the band (Garza's) is but a collection of cheap marauders, organized within the United States boundary, makes the Mexican people laugh at the exaggerated reports. Were it not that they operated along the boundary and talked revolution, the press would regard the marauders as no more than a band of train robbers."

Unfortunately the boundary line between Mexico and the United States used to be one of the places where revolutions against the Mexican government could be most easily organized. The results of these revolutions were as varied as the circumstances under which they were initiated and the personal antecedents and conditions of the leaders who headed them.

For some time the plans of the Mexican malcontents had not assumed a tangible shape, when about two years ago one Francisco Ruiz Sandoval, a Mexican by birth, and a man of turbulent disposition, who has taken part in several of the political upheavals which have occurred in the Central American republics, aided by other Mexican emigrants living on the frontier, organized in Texas an armed expedition, which about the 24th of June, 1890, passed over to Mexican territory. This band crossed the Rio Grande in two parties, the first, composed of twenty-four men, near Laredo, and the other of twelve men, near Guerrero, in Tamaulipas. They moved around localities unprotected by garrisons for some hours—less than a day—and as soon as the Mexican forces ordered to pursue them approached, they returned to Texas. Instead of having the support of the Mexicans, as they expected, they found that the frontier towns of Mexico had organized and armed themselves for defence against the marauding bands. On complaint being made by the government of Mexico, the parties who had violated the neutrality laws of the country were arrested in *flagrante delictu*. They were tried in San Antonio, Tex., before the District Court for the Western District of Texas, and, notwithstanding that their crime was notorious, and that the proof was conclusive, the jury acquitted them on the 22nd of December following. Although this result is not strange when it is considered that a political character is given to such events, and that their perpetrators are held up to the jury as martyrs and heroes, it naturally served as a great stimulus for further movements of a like nature, as in the Garza case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A man named Catarino E. Garza, a restless and wayward character, whose only education appears to have been that of a printer, decided to follow Ruiz Sandoval's footsteps. He was born in a frontier town of Mexico, but has spent nearly all his life in Texas, where he has committed various crimes and left a reputation anything but enviable. Taking advantage of the turbulent and discontented elements on the frontier, where many Mexicans had collected who, owing to the loss of their crops at home for want of rain during the last year, had gone there in search of work, which they failed to secure, he organized a band which crossed the Rio Grande into the State of Tamaulipas three different times. This man is absolutely unknown in Mexico. He has, therefore, no prestige or influence, nor any support. His posing as a revolutionist against the Mexican government, residing as he does in a foreign country, upon whose worst elements he draws, is as absurd as would be the attempt of a man born in the United States who having passed all his life in Canada was therefore unknown in his own country, to head a revolution made up of people recruited in that Dominion to overthrow the government of the United States.

Garza's first incursion into Mexican territory took place on the 15th of September, 1891, and was made by a party of twenty-six men, increased afterwards by twelve more. They crossed near Mier, and remained nine days in the state of Tamaulipas, making raids along the Rio Grande between Reinosa and Camargo.

The second expedition crossed over on the 7th of November of the same year opposite the Agua Negra ranch, numbered seventy odd men, and remained only five days on Mexican soil, having returned on the 12th. On the 8th it approached Agua Leguas, but the citizens being armed the town was not attacked. On Wednesday, the 11th, the Garza band was overtaken and defeated by the Mexican forces at Derramadero de las Ovejas.

The third expedition numbering ninety-two men was headed by Cármen Ibañez, as Garza did not accompany it, and crossed into Mexico near Guerrero, Tamaulipas, on the 20th of December following. On the same day, at Las Tortillas ranch, they surprised Captain Cristóbal Enriquez, who with a detachment of twelve men retreated, leaving two dead and two wounded, after having killed three of the enemy. On the 21st they were overtaken at Arroyo del Bagre, between Vallecillo and Parás, by Captain Pedro Reyes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with forty men of the Thirteenth Regiment who routed them. After scattering in the chaparral they retreated to the Rio Grande. Lieutenant Indalecio Sada overtook them near this river on the 22d, and they fled to Texas, abandoning three carbines and five horses. During the pursuit they left on Mexican territory six men killed, several stands of arms, forty horses, and a number of stragglers who were afterwards captured, four of whom died of their wounds.

On the last two occasions the Garza bands went as far as the frontier of the State of Nueva Leon. On the three occasions they only stayed on Mexican soil long enough to enable the Mexican forces engaged in their pursuit to come upon them. On none of these three occasions did they attack any town of importance, and all they did was to harass and rob defenceless persons on their march. Neither did they engage any considerable Mexican force, and whenever overtaken they fled, returning to Texas.

Colonel Nieves Hernandez, who commanded a regiment of cavalry of the Mexican army, and who was under orders to pursue Garza's bands, on the occasion of his two first raids did not do so effectively, and this accounts for their being able to remain on Mexican soil nine days on the first and five on the second occasion. As Colonel Hernandez failed to comply in these two instances with the rules of the military service, he was tried by a court-martial, which met in Monterey, and was condemned to death, which sentence is now pending on appeal to the Supreme Court Martial in the City of Mexico.

As regards the elements which Garza had at his command on his three expeditions, I should state that when once the Federal forces of the United States were closely pursuing Garza, and were on the point of capturing him at the Palito Blanco Ranch in Texas, belonging to his father-in-law, Alejandro Gonzalez, he abandoned his horse, his arms and equipments. Among other things there was found a diary in which he had recorded the names of the persons who had assisted him pecuniarily, and of all those who had pledged themselves to his cause, offering to enlist in his ranks, and various other details which throw much light upon the origin, scope, and purposes of his movements, and of the elements upon which he relied. From this it appears that up to the end of January last he had recorded as pledged to him nine hundred and ninety-seven men and two hundred and fifty-three officers, divided into eight army corps, of all of whom he con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidered himself commander-in-chief; that the money advances which he had received amounted to $19,640, and that the expenses incurred up to that date had reached $6,541.75.

Notwithstanding that according to this data he had more than a thousand persons pledged, no force one hundred strong ever crossed over into Mexico. The money secured appears to have been in the form of voluntary donations made by various persons, some of whom had, to all appearances, a remote hope that Garza's chimerical attempt would excite a revolution in Mexico, and that they could then reimburse themselves through the profits that such disturbances afford. Others gave him money as speculators and investors, and almost all came from the immediate frontier of Texas and Mexico. Only one sum, of $2,000, came from New York, the contribution of one individual.

General Stanley estimates in an interview had with a reporter of the Washington *Post*, published on the 30th of March last, that Garza had a force of eleven hundred men. Probably he includes all the soldiers and officers who appear as pledged on his rolls, but he says that only two hundred and fifty-five men took an active part in the movements. It appears from authentic sources that they barely reached two hundred, as follows: The band that crossed over to Mexico on the 20th of December under command of Cármen Ibañez, on the third incursion, had ninety-two men; the band organized in La Grulla, Tex., under the command of Eustorgio Ramon, had sixty men; and the band organized in Ceja del Prieto, Tex., under command of Catarino E. Garza, had fifty men—total, two hundred and two men.

General Stanley also said that it was Garza's father-in-law who provided the greater part of the money to further the ambitious designs of his son-in-law, and he believes that the latter will wreck the entire fortune of the former. General Stanley furthermore says that on Garza's rolls there were thirty-five escaped felons, who would rather die than be captured, and that one of them, named Ramon, had killed four men in a street fight in Mexico (Camargo); that he wounded another in an affray and killed three policemen who attempted to arrest him. This is the kind of men that composed the Garza bands.

Let us now see how these occurrences have been presented by the press of the United States: Garza's movements and supporters were not only grossly exaggerated, but battles were manufactured and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

events that never occurred were invented, with the purpose of inspiring the belief that Garza's operations were of a serious nature and of grave import to Mexico. It would take too long, and it is not essential to my purpose, to enumerate all the ungrounded reports published by the newspapers of Texas and transmitted from the frontier to the dailies of the United States concerning the movements of Garza and incidents connected therewith; hence I shall limit myself to the mention of a few of them only.

Hardly had Garza begun to organize his bands when the newspapers of Texas, and especially the San Antonio *Daily Express*, which appears to have taken the lead and actually was his principal organ, published the intelligence that Mexico was all excitement, ready to rise up against the existing government, and that the country as a whole only awaited the coming of Catarino E. Garza to unite with his bands and overthrow that government. These bands entered Mexico on three different occasions, and at no time did one single body of Mexicans rally to them, and in no portion of the country was a demonstration made in their favor. The small body of men which Garza commanded was increased by the newspapers to five thousand, afterwards to ten thousand, and eventually reached the figure of twenty-five thousand men. The insignificant skirmishes—if they deserve that name—which the Garza bands had in Mexico, and in which they were always routed, were given out as great battles, from which they, of course, emerged victorious. Such news was not only published in the newspapers of Texas, but was sent broadcast from that State to all the papers in the United States, accepted as true by them, and was published and commented on in their columns.

A telegram dated Rio Grande City, Tex., the 16th of November, 1891, represented the encounter with Captain Enriquez, to which reference has been made, as a decisive battle gained by the Garza bands against one hundred men of the Mexican army. It stated further that Garza had not left Mexican territory since he entered it on the 15th of the previous September, and that during that time he was stirring up the revolutionary spirit in the states of Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas.

Telegrams from Brownsville and San Antonio, dated respectively the 18th and 19th of November, 1891, asserted that Garza was at the head of a considerable force; that he had defeated the Federal soldiers who were sent in his pursuit, and that he was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threatening Nuevo Laredo, when in fact Garza's second expedition had been back in Texas since the 11th of the same November.

The dailies of the 31st of December, 1891, stated that about eight hundred men of the Mexican Federal forces, who were stationed at Mier, Tamaulipas, under General Lorenzo Garcia, and who were under orders to pursue Garza's bands on their third raid, had rebelled, murdered their commanding officer, and had crossed over to Texas to join Garza. This was a story invented to create the impression that the Mexican army was disorganized and that the government of Mexico could not uphold itself.

A little later, and for the purpose of disparaging the Mexican government, it was said that Colonel Hernandez had been assassinated by the Mexican authorities, whereas he was enjoying, and now enjoys, at the City of Mexico, in the trial instituted against him, all the guarantees afforded by the Mexican law.

In the latter part of last January, when it could be no longer maintained that Garza's bands were on Mexican soil, telegrams were published, in which, without admitting the failure of his plans, or that he had returned to Texas, it was asserted that owing to the drying up of the pasture on the frontier, Garza had been forced to suspend military operations until spring; that he had many followers, and that the whole nation would rise when he should again take up arms. This also was pure fiction.

The stories manufactured in Texas regarding the movements of Garza succeeded in greatly impressing themselves upon even impartial and thoughtful persons. Mr. T. C. Swope, a special correspondent sent to the frontier by the New York *World* to watch the movements of Garza, wrote that journal a letter, dated Rio Grande City, Tex., February 8, 1892, and published on the 14th, asserting that there were important elements in Mexico which favored a revolution. He based his supposition upon the supposed discontent with the existing government, and stated that any bold and intelligent leader could seriously disturb the peace of the republic. If this were so, why did the Garza bands on the three occasions they trod on Mexican soil, remaining several days each time, meet with no sympathy whatever?

It was also stated that the Mexican government had offered a reward of $300,000 for the capture and delivery of Catarina E. Garza, and this report circulated, gaining much credence throughout the country. The truth is that the government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Mexico never offered any reward for the capture of Garza.

As though these fictions were not enough the New York *Herald* on the 28th of February published a telegram dated at Kansas City, Mo., on the 27th, which conveyed the intelligence that one Frank Wilson asserted that he had been at the theatre of Garza's operations; that the latter was in the City of Mexico, from which point he directed the movements of his subordinates ; that he is a very popular man ; that there is much discontent in Mexico ; that the country was on the eve of a great convulsion, and that one of the members of the cabinet of the President of Mexico figured at the head of the movement.

In the latter part of January of the present year, local elections were held in La Ascension, Chihuahua, which occasioned a fray resulting in the death of one or two persons and the wounding of others. This fact was at once coupled with Garza's movements, and the *Times*, of New York, on the 16th of February, 1892, published a telegram dated the 15th, at El Paso, Tex., in which it was said that there had been two engagements in the state of Chihuahua between revolutionists and the government forces ; one at Temochic and the other at Alamos (Alamos is in Sonora, and neither did anything occur there), and that in both engagements the government forces had been defeated—in the first with a loss of twenty men, and in the second with a loss of eight. It was further stated that the whole State of Chihuahua was ready for insurrection, influenced by the clergy. This was also a complete fabrication.

With the same object in view, that of discrediting the government of Mexico, and of creating ill will against it in the United States, a telegram was sent from San Antonio, Tex., dated the 17th of February, 1892, which was published, among other journals, by the New York *Times* of the 18th, in which it was asserted that the house of Señor Don Enrique Vizcaya, Consular Agent of the United States in Mier, Tamaulipas, had been forcibly entered by command of General Garcia, the same one who was supposed to have been killed by his soldiers, the agent being suspected of sympathizing with Garza and of having arms and munitions secreted, and that the Vizcaya family had suffered gross indignities at the hands of the soldiery. I am in the habit, when I see articles of this character published in the newspapers of the United States, of requesting information from the proper authorities in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mexico, with a view of bringing about the punishment of the offenders in case there is any foundation for such articles, or to deny authoritatively their truth, if, as generally happens, they prove to be false. Information regarding Señor Vizcaya's house having been requested, the story turns out to have been likewise manufactured out of the whole cloth.

I believe these examples, which I could multiply greatly were I to take time to record all the false reports magnifying Garza's movements, printed by the Texas press and communicated to and republished by the leading dailies of the country are sufficient to demonstrate that there existed the pre-conceived purpose, persistently carried out, to impose upon public credulity, causing it to accept as true the most improbable and absurd stories.

Different motives have been attributed to the movements of Garza. It was at first said, in a telegram dated at Laredo, on the 4th of January, 1892, and published by the New York *Herald* of the 5th, that from the papers taken from Pablo Muñoz, one of Garza' s followers, when he was captured in an engagement, in Texas, with the United States forces, it appears that Bishop Montes de Oca, of San Luis Potosi, and young Don Augustin de Iturbide were mixed up in the frontier movements. It is not true that this appeared from said papers, which were shortly afterwards published in English by the New York *World*, and which have been carefully examined by Mexican officials.

Any one acquainted with the existing political situation in Mexico will understand that the foregoing story could not be correct. Although it is natural that the Church party, which is the avowed antagonist of the Liberal party now in power, should desire the latter's overthrow in order to succeed in the government, the Conservative party is completely disorganized, and exceedingly unpopular on account of the defeat it suffered when it asked for and supported the foreign intervention, and it is, besides, fully aware that should it take up as leader so obscure and unfit a man as Garza, it would very seriously endanger its situation, without any probabilities of success. Garza, moreover, professes to belong to the Liberal party, and it is clear that he could not for that reason be chosen as leader of a Conservative party. If young Don Augustin de Iturbide has any probability of later reaching a political position in Mexico, it will be through the Conservatives, and, therefore, he must follow the fortunes of that party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has also been said that a syndicate of speculators, who wished to lower the price of Mexican bonds in London, instigated the disorder. Neither does this story appear to be well founded, for in the first place the news of those disturbances did not seriously affect the price of Mexican bonds in London. For the week ending September 15, 1891, the date of Garza's first raid in Mexico, the price in London of the six per cent. Mexican bonds of 1888 was from 87 to 88; and on the 31st of December following, when the third and last expedition had already returned to Texas, they were quoted at 85 to 86, which shows that during those movements there was a decrease in price of only two per cent. It is true that about the 19th of November, 1891, they fell to 79, but they soon recovered. Besides, since the routing and complete disorganization of Garza's bands, the fall in the price of the six per cent. Mexican bonds has continued, they being quoted at the end of February, 1892, when all cause for alarm had ceased, at 80. It is therefore more natural to attribute their depreciation to the general falling in the securities of all the Latin-American nations, which was occasioned principally by the revolutionary movements which have recently taken place with varied success in some of the South American republics.

No less absurd is the story that the instigators of those disturbances are citizens of the United States who have received very liberal concessions from the Mexican government, and who, it is supposed, encourage the disorders with the hope of bringing about the annexation of Mexico to the United States, thereby giving a greater value to the properties and franchises they have acquired in the former country. It should be remembered, in the first place, that there is not now, either in the United States or in Mexico, any serious element favoring annexation, and that it would be folly for private individuals to undertake it without relying on the support of their country. They would secure no other result than the depreciation of their holdings, and probably the complete ruin of their properties. Besides, from the entries in Garza's diary, which there is reason to believe are correct, it appears that although among the contributors are some who might be considered as enemies of the present administration of Mexico, there is not one who could even be suspected as representing any combination of any standing, whether of a civil, religious, financial, political, or military character.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although the movements of Garza were unimportant, even insignificant, their practical results have been serious and far-reaching, on account of the importance given to them by the press of the United States, and they have probably been more prejudicial to the United States than to Mexico. It is true that some of the inhabitants of the Mexican frontier suffered robberies and extortions through the bands of Garza during the few days they raided the state of Tamaulipas. It is also true that the false news published by the journals of the United States regarding those movements gave rise for some time to serious apprehensions in the minds of such people as had no other source of information than the newspapers as to the stability of the Mexican government; all of which occasioned the inconveniences natural in such cases. But the principal evils brought about by what might be called the inventive faculty of the press reporters have been felt by the United States. Its territory was made the theatre of war, if the armed resistance which Garza's bands offered to arrest by Federal and local forces in pursuit of them may be called war. The battles, if it is desired to so designate the encounters, have been fought in the territory of Texas. The laws of the United States have been violated; peace has been disturbed in an important region of Texas, and the armed resistance of Garza's bands has brought about the death and wounding of soldiers and agents of justice of the United States. The alarm which those false reports produced, and which might have affected somewhat the credit of Mexico, prevented companies in the United States that are constructing and own railways in Mexico from advantageously placing their bonds in Europe in order to raise the necessary funds to continue their works.

In the quoted interview of a Washington *Post* reporter with General Stanley, that official said that those disturbances had prevented the sale of public lands in Texas, which otherwise would have been sold immediately. Mr. Ryan, United States Minister to Mexico, stated in the interview before cited with a reporter of the *Evening News*, of Chicago, that those movements had created alarm and produced a bad influence on the trade of the United States with Mexico.

The clearest exposition of the evils suffered by the State of Texas from the Garza raids I find in an editorial in the *Daily News*, of Laredo, Tex., of the 7th of March which reads as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Many sales of land have been stopped by the stories about Garza's revolution; tourists have been kept away; health seekers have not come; passenger and freight business has fallen off; railroads stopped; improvements and the emigrant have kept far away, on account of the Garza bug-a-boo. It is time to end this nonsense, and there is no true friend of this section of Texas who will not do all in his power to secure the arrest of this visionary revolutionist who thinks he can conquer Mexico by hiding in a hole in Texas."

The suspension of trade, one of the results of that alarm, has injured not only the merchants of the United States, who have curtailed their operations, but also the railways, whose receipts from freight and passengers destined for Mexico have decreased.

From this succinct and truthful narrative of the facts, it appears that a man, visionary or perverted, or both, attempted to disturb the peace of Mexico, without having adequate means to carry his design to a successful issue, and that his efforts in this direction, which found no echo in Mexico, would have been taken as those of a fool or a bandit had it not been for the importance given to them by the press of the United States.

The exaggerating and magnifying of the importance of that chimerical attempt has produced serious and far-reaching injuries, which are notorious, and there is no one from whom to demand satisfaction, or upon whom to attach responsibility, and this fact shows that the existing condition of things in the United States is such that one man can, in cases like this, cause numberless and grievous wrongs without redress for the injured party and with the fullest immunity for the authors or abettors. The laws of the United States vouchsafe no legal, diplomatic or other remedy for such evils. There is no redress for the injuries that the government of the United States may suffer through false or exaggerated publications directed against it, and much less is there a remedy for those that may be originated with like purpose or effect against a foreign government. This also shows that the desire of the journals of the United States to give sensational news, however absurd, carries them often to the extreme of accepting without reserve, and without judgment and due discretion, whatever is told them, no matter how foolish it may be, and this fact has greatly contributed abroad to detract from the reliability of the news published by the press of the United States, and if this evil is not corrected it will end in throwing increased discredit upon the newspapers of the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is natural that a truly independent press, like the American press, should be very jealous of its liberty, and that it should not suppress the publication of any news. It is also natural that in dealing with political up-risings in Latin-American republics, especially when experience has shown that the established governments always strive to belittle, to the extent of ridicule, the revolutionary movements organized to overthrow them, it should publish news showing both sides of the question in order that impartial people may form a correct judgment. But it appears equally natural that journals which desire to publish truthful news, and are unwilling to become the unconscious tools of low and debased passions, should use discretion, and receive with distrust news that comes through persons who on former occasions have knowingly furnished ungrounded and malicious information. If an American journal is satisfied that the matter furnished it by news agencies, private individuals or special correspondents is false, it should naturally infer that if such agencies, persons or correspondents act in good faith, either they have not exercised discretion enough to distinguish truth from falsehood, or they have become the agents of illegitimate interests. Once satisfied of this, it cannot be conceived how the newspapers can continue to publish news of agencies or persons which make their columns the organ of illegal enterprises. If they declined to publish such news and refused to pay for it because of its falsity, it is probable that these evils would be largely corrected.

In a word, there are, to my mind, two points which deserve reflection and study: First, Is it possible to find an effective guarantee that those injured by false political news published in newspapers may obtain redress, since the means provided by existing legislation are wholly inadequate? Second, Is it to the interest of the principal dailies of the United States which wield such powerful influence in the forming and controlling of public opinion, to constitute themselves unconscious accessories of bastard aims and plans, to the material injury of the interests of the country and of their own credit and respectability? I would that others more capable than I should take up these questions, aiming to arrive at a solution which, while guaranteeing the fullest liberty to the press, will prevent it from becoming the agent and instrument of low passions, to the positive injury of social interests.

M. ROMERO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELECTIONEERING METHODS IN ENGLAND.

BY H. W. LUCY, AUTHOR OF "A DIARY OF TWO PARLIAMENTS," ETC.

MANY Reform Bills have been passed through the English Parliament since 1832, and the franchise is to-day so comprehensive as to seem practically near manhood suffrage. Nevertheless, the retreat before the advance of Democracy has been slow and stubborn, and during its progress the classes have been able here and there to plant stockades that still resist the forward rush of the masses. With a population that almost touches thirty-eight millions the register of voters for the United Kingdom just exceeds six millions. How far this falls short of manhood suffrage will appear from the fact that there are eight million families tabulated in the census figures, and it may be presumed that each, whether in the case of father or elder brother, includes a male adult.

But the statement that there are six millions on the register far exceeds the number of individuals who have a vote. Plural voting, one of the anomalies the Liberals are pledged to remove at the earliest opportunity, is still legalized and is widely availed of. In one of his speeches in the recent Midlothian campaign Mr. Gladstone cited a case, brought under his notice on indisputable authority, where a single man possessed forty votes. As some people give themselves up to the craze of collecting china or first editions of books, this gentleman had devoted time and money to the acquisition of this rare, probably unique, collection of Parliamentary votes. The enterprise was one involving the exercise of much skill and management. The connoisseur would have ever to bear in mind the strictly marked limit of time within which a general election is completed. The statute sets forth that in boroughs an election must take place within nine days (exclusive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Sunday) from the receipt of the writ. In counties the first possible day for polling is the seventh after receiving the writ, the last day being the seventeenth. Since it would be no use to possess a vote unless it were available, the collector, it will appear, must needs bear in mind these considerations, and must so arrange the area of his possession that, with ordinary luck in the way of avoiding the clashing of dates, he may cover the whole ground within the limit of nine days for the boroughs and sixteen for the counties. As the Liberals intend, when their chance comes, not only to establish the principle of "One man, One vote," but to fix all the polling at a general election to take place on one day, plural votes are already a drug in the market, and will presently become of as little value as albums of old postage-stamps and other curios that have had their day.

This possibility of six million electors exercising the franchise, inadequate as it is in comparison to the population, shows an immense advance on the state of things existing so recently as 1859. Speaking in that year Mr. Bright stated that the so-called appeal to the country which had taken place in the previous year was actually an appeal to 800,000 men, whilst, as the total of the poll showed, not more than half the number responded. The electorate were, at that time even more heavily than now, hampered by the stockades alluded to. The most formidable of these is found in the regulations of the register, which are evidently designed to limit as far as possible the opportunities of the masses. Both of the great political parties engage paid agents to look after the register in the various constituencies. By these persons acting in the interest of their several parties, omissions made by the overseers in the duty of placing properly qualified electors on the register are to a great extent corrected. But the stipulations as to date which hem in the register practically disfranchise a large proportion of the working classes. In the general election which has just taken place in England no man was able to vote unless he had occupied and paid rates for a house during the full period of twelve months ending the 15th of July, 1891. This means—the date of occupation commencing in July, 1890—that a man must have been a resident for fully two years in the same electoral district if he would exercise the franchise understood to be his birthright. The laboring population of England is ever shifting as work fails in one place and promise of it beckons from another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The consequence is that in considering the tactics of a general election it is always found desirable in the Conservative interest to fix the date for a late period of the year, when the voting must needs be on an old register. This is another wheel in the electoral machinery which the Liberals propose to oil when they come into power.

Household suffrage is the basis of parliamentary franchise alike in counties and boroughs. In the counties there are also leasehold and copyhold franchises and for freehold property of forty shillings value and upwards. In Plantagenet days Parliaments were annual or even oftener. In 1694 a Triennial Act was passed and was some twenty years later repealed in favor of the Septennial Act which at this day covers the duration of the life of Parliament. Shorter Parliaments is another plank in the Liberal programme drawn up and subscribed at Newcastle this year. But though Parliaments may sit the full term of seven years they never do, the occasions being rare when a period of six years is exceeded.

When Parliament is sitting by-elections follow upon vacancies created by various causes, such as death, promotion to peerage, acceptance of office within direct gift of the Crown, or, as has happened in two cases during the life of the present Parliament, by expulsion of a sitting member. There was a time, strange as it appears in this day, when election to serve in Parliament was regarded as a drudgery, to be avoided at any cost. Thence arose the stipulation that no duly-elected member may at his own will retire from his place in the Legislature. This law is evaded by another clause of the statute, which vacates a seat upon the acceptance by a member of a place of profit under the Crown. Thus when a member wishes, for private reasons, to resign his seat, he makes formal application to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the post of Steward of the Chiltern Hundreds, a shadowy office, his being formally established in which *ipso facto* forfeits his seat in Parliament, and if he wants to get back he can do so only after reëlection.

In the case of by-elections the issue of a writ is moved in the House by the whip of the party to which the retiring member has belonged. It is thereupon issued on the warrant of the Speaker. There being no Speaker in existence when Parliament has been dissolved, the Queen in council issues a warrant addressed to the Lord Chancellors of Great Britain and Ireland, who in turn di-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rect the Clerk of the Crown to issue the writs. These documents are addressed to the returning officers in the various counties and towns, with whom, thereafter, rests the direction of the business of election. In boroughs the returning officer is the Mayor, the Sheriff acting in that capacity in counties. When a member comes up to Westminster after his election, he is not permitted to take the oath or sign the roll till he has handed to the Clerk of Parliament the return to the writ duly attested by Sheriff or Mayor. When he is brought up to the table by the two members who have undertaken to introduce him, he is always met at the corner of the table by the clerk, who stands with outstretched hand. Sometimes a nervous member, misconstruing this action, seizes the hand and warmly shakes it. Others find they have forgotten to bring with them the document for which it is extended. No one who was in the House when the present Lord Chancellor, after many reverses in the electoral field, came up to take his seat for Launceston, will forget the scene. Sir Hardinge Giffard, as he then was, had mislaid the return to the writ. He was positive he had brought it down to the House, and felt convinced it must be secreted somewhere about his person. Standing in the centre of a crowded and laughing House, the new Solicitor General proceeded to search in all his pockets for the document, producing out of each more miscellaneous papers than it seemed possible for a man of his stature to carry about with him. When in his hurried agonized search he had nearly buried the mace under papers, Sir Henry James, who had accompanied him to the table, returned with the missing document, which he had found under the bench where the new member had sat awaiting the summons to the table.

In the good old times nomination used to be an early and prominent ordeal through which candidates passed on their way to Parliament. A wooden structure was erected, a vast crowd assembled, and the candidates having struggled their way through were proposed, seconded, and made speeches in reply. These public nominations were perfect pandemoniums, fitly ushering in the state of things that used to exist, and which is found pictured in the plates of Gilroy and Cruikshank, and in the account of the Eatonswill election, which, extravagant as it seems, was merely a transcript from Charles Dickens' note-book as a newspaper reporter. Much more recent memory recalls this cu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rious custom. I have a vivid recollection of an election in Shropshire, in the general elections of 1865, on a description of which for a local newspaper I tried my prentice hand. One of the candidates was Sir Baldwin Leighton, father of the present baronet. He had affronted public opinion in some action taken in his magisterial capacity touching possession of certain rabbit skins. When he presented himself in front of the platform to accept the nomination just moved and seconded, the sky suddenly became obscured by a sudden shower of rabbit skins, with which the hapless candidate was pelted throughout the discreetly brief continuance of his address.

Under existing regulations the nomination of a parliamentary candidate is a dull, business-like arrangement, got over in a few minutes in a back room in the town or county hall. Any two registered electors may propose and second a candidate, using nomination forms provided by the returning officer. No nomination paper will be accepted unless, in addition to the mover and seconder, eight other registered electors of the constituency sign it. Only the candidate, his proposer, seconder, and one other person, usually his agent, may attend the nomination which must be accomplished before noon on the appointed day.

As the elector is deprived of the interest and excitement of the old nomination day, so is the act of voting reduced to the simplest proportion. The voting is taken by ballot in much the same way as the process is accomplished in the United States. The system is scarcely yet acclimatized in this country, more especially in the rural districts, where the voter, long accustomed to domination of parson and squire, has difficulty in believing that their eye is not upon him even in the recesses of the polling place. There are, however, shining exceptions to this density of perception. One is recorded from a Hampshire polling place. The elector, a plowman, was brought up to the polling place by his employer, a farmer, enthusiastically attached to Conservative colors. "Be sure," he said, "to mark the cross against the name at the top of the paper, and you'll be all right." "Did you do it?" he asked, when the voter came out of the polling booth. "Yes," said the plowman, "but (this explanation was reserved for the private ear of another audience) I first took care to turn the paper upside down." Another voter, of the Roman Catholic faith, was instructed that on going to the poll he should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put an X opposite the name of Mr. Fraser Mackintosh, one of the candidates. Misunderstanding the injunction, he, on entering the booth, alarmed the polling sheriff by dropping on his knees, crossing himself, and crying aloud on "Fraser Mackintosh!"

The direct effect of recent legislation, reforming the electoral system, has been to reduce the cost of elections. History is full of records of ruinous contests taking place under the ancient system. Among the most famous elections in the old style was that which took place in Westminster in 1784, when Fox offered himself for reëlection. This was the contest in which the Duchess of Devonshire took so prominent and influential a part. Walpole has a good deal to say on the subject. Writing under date of April 13, in this year, he says: "During her canvass the Duchess made no scruple of visiting the humblest of the electors, dazzling and enchanting them by the fascination of her manner, the power of her beauty, and the influence of her high rank, sometimes carrying off to the hustings (meaning the polling place) the meanest mechanic in her own carriage." Six days later Lord Cornwallis writes: "The Duchess of Devonshire is indefatigable in her canvass for Fox. She was in the most blackguard houses in Long Acre by eight o'clock in the morning." It was in this neighborhood that a butcher, whose vote was not to be purchased on other terms, sold it for a kiss from the gracious dame, who to this day lives on Gainsborough's canvass.

Another person who took scarcely a less prominent part in the contest was the Prince of Wales. It was said he canvassed in person for a candidate whose cause was dear to him, since it was hateful to his royal father and mother. There is no doubt that members of his household were engaged day and night in furthering the fortunes of the great Whig. On the day the poll was won the Prince, who had been in attendance upon the King at a review at Ascot, posted home and, wearing Fox's colors, rode up St. James street amid the acclamations of a Whig mob. How far partisanship was carried in those days is indicated by the fact that Washington, in arms across the Atlantic against King George, having clothed his army in uniform of buff and blue, Fox adopted those colors as his own, the Prince of Wales positively ordering a uniform of the rebel colors and appearing in public so distinguished.

For full forty days the polling lasted, during which time the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strand and the neighborhood of Covent Garden were crowded with mobs who took each other by the throat whenever they met. What with the actual expenditure in money by the candidates, the loss of time to a mass of people engaged in the contest, and the general demoralization that spread, a Parliamentary contest at the beginning of the century was nothing less than a public calamity. Wilberforce first gained his seat at this same general election, 1784, coming in for Hull at a cost out of his private purse of nearly £9,000. Bribery and trading were then matters of course. Wilberforce has stated that he found at Hull it was the openly established custom to give a resident elector a present of two guineas. He got double that sum if he plumped his vote, and every freeman brought in from London to vote cost the candidate £10. There was then, as now, a law against bribery, but it was evaded by the simple contrivance of withholding actual payment till the last day on which an election petition might be presented.

In 1807 Wilberforce took part in another and more memorable and more costly contest for the County of Yorkshire. The fact that within a week over £64,000 were subscribed to meet Wilberforce's expenses shows how high party feeling ran. Mr. Weller, Sr., has given an interesting and what is regarded in some quarters as an apocryphal account of how he influenced the course of an election by disposing of a coachload of voters committed to his charge. But what took place at election times in Merry England at the beginning of the century puts Mr. Weller's modest story in the shade. At an election for Berwick the Whig candidate provided a sloop to convey a number of freemen from London to Berwick. The other side got at the skipper, with the result that he missed his way on a familiar course and, pulling in at a Norwegian port, the electors did not arrive at their destination till the poll was closed. Precisely the very same thing took place at an Ipswich election, a batch of freemen going down from London finding themselves at Antwerp; and at Newcastle, where another cargo was delivered at Ostend and not reshipped till the election was over.

All that is changed now, and parliamentary elections have come to be prosaic performances, the most exciting incident being the blocking up of Fleet street by a crowd waiting to see the result of the various constituencies flashed on a white sheet by means of a magic lantern. These are our present-day election

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manners. One thing that went to the root of the matter was the strict limitation of electioneering expenses decreed by the Corrupt Practices Act passed by Mr. Gladstone in his government of 1880. A maximum scale of expenditure is fixed and any proved excess invalidates the election. Standing for a borough of 2,000 electors a candidate may not disburse, either by himself or through his agent, a sum exceeding £350. For every additional thousand electors an extra £30 is permitted. In the counties where the area is wider and the inevitable expense larger, £650 is the legalized expense for a minimum register of 2,000 electors, with an increase of £60 for every additional thousand. The candidate is allowed a certain amount of pocket money. But if during and upon his election he spends more than £100, a detailed account must be sent in to the returning offices. Within thirty-five days of the close of the election, candidates are required to pay all their accounts and send in particulars with a statutory declaration solemnly affirming that the account is full and accurate.

Another straight blow delivered at corrupt practices by this same act was the prohibition of the use of hired carriages for conveying voters to the poll. The Duchess of Devonshire, were she now alive and interested in the Westminster or other contests, might, if she pleased, kiss an occasional butcher. But she would imperil her friend's election if she afterwards conveyed the pleased elector to the poll in a hired carriage. So searching is the act in this matter that it positively prohibits gratuitous use at an election of "any carriage, horse or other animal, ordinarily kept or used for the purpose of letting out for hire." In one of the Edinburgh elections just closed a curious point arose on this section of the statute. An elector drove up to the poll and paid the driver his legal fare, one shilling; the driver was observed shortly after to enter the poll and record his vote. The question agitating local authorities, one that may yet be argued in a court of law, is, Was the cabman conveyed to the poll, contrary to the statute, in a conveyance "ordinarily kept or used for the purpose of letting out for hire?"

The process of parliamentary elections in the United Kingdom does not vary in any of its constituent parts. There are some local customs obtaining in one place and non-existent in another. But they are not material. For example, in all parts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electors have the right to cross-examine candidates coming before them at public meetings, but Scotch electors lay themselves out for enjoyment of the privilege with characteristic deliberation and determination. To the extent to which it is carried out north of the Tweed it is exclusively a Scotch habit, and has a quaintly expressive Scotch name. It is called "heckling." Up to the date of the general election just concluded Mr. Gladstone had escaped the ordeal, no one presuming to heckle him. At one of his meetings, held in a suburb of Edinburgh, the spell was broken. At Corstorphine, as the place is called, there is a local brewer named Usher, a stolid, dour man, who saw no reason why, because the candidate was illustrious, individual electors should not emerge from their obscurity and "heckle" him. Accordingly, when Mr. Gladstone had finished his speech, Mr. Usher rose with quite a bundle of manuscript in his hand, presumably containing questions. At sight of him the audience set up a roar of execration that would have made some men shrink into their boots. Providentially Mr. Usher is deaf, and may have thought what he heard was a whisper of encouragement. Moreover he, to common local knowledge, wears a wig, and Scotch "wut" broke forth in hilarious cries of "Go and get your hair cut!"

Mr. Gladstone at length succeeded in obtaining a hearing for his interlocutor, and answered a question about his view of the plan of campaign that should have sufficed, but impervious, implacable Mr. Usher went on. "Am I," he said, "to understand"—Mr. Gladstone was at this moment seated in his chair with hand to ear, endeavoring through the growing clamor to catch what he called "this respected gentleman's" remarks. He caught this one, and, leaping to his feet with catapultic energy, leaned over the platform rail and shouted in Mr. Usher's more vulnerable ear: "I cannot answer for this gentleman's understanding. I am responsible to Almighty God for the measure of intelligence in this skull," he continued, rapping his own, "but I am not responsible for the amount of intelligence Almighty God has placed in *that* skull;" and he pointed with a wave of infinite contempt at the interrogative brewer. Sitting close by Mr. Gladstone on the platform, and catching sight of his gleaming eyes as they flashed on the hapless brewer standing below, I never saw the human face and figure so perfectly resemble an enraged eagle clawing at its prey.

H. W. LUCY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ILLUMINATING POWER OF ANECDOTE.

BY S. ARTHUR BENT.

A WRITER of the last century thought to discredit anecdotes by calling them "the luxuries of literature." According to his definition they merely gratify the love of intellectual indolence by their conciseness, while they feed the appetite for novelty by their infinite variety. As, however, the human element has become more prominent in historical composition, the biographies of individuals are as important to the student as the archives of a department of state. "Biography," says Carlyle, "is the only true history," and anecdote is of the essence of biography.

While the introduction of the personal element into historic narrative deepens the impression of events which the historian wishes to make in the reader's mind, the absence of this element divests history of its human aspect, and reduces it to a dry, uninteresting, and, therefore, uninstructive statement of facts. Thus Hume closes his account of the reign of Charles II. by saying that in the midst of wise and virtuous designs concerning Scotland, the King was seized with a sudden fit resembling apoplexy, and, after languishing a few days, died, having shown himself indifferent to the exhortations of the Protestant clergy, finally receiving the sacraments from a Catholic priest. Contrast this bald statement of an important historic event with Macaulay's brilliant description of the appearance of the court on the eve of the King's attack, a Sunday night, when grave persons who had gone thither to pay their respects to their sovereign were struck with astonishment and horror as they saw the great gallery of Whitehall crowded with revellers, among whom sat the King, chatting and toying with his favorites, while a French page warbled amorous verses, and courtiers were seated at tables "on which the gold was heaped in mountains." And thus, throughout the terrible scenes of the monarch's illness, the historian deepens, by graphic details, the impression he wishes to make of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the profligacy of the reign of the royal pensioner of France, while through the gloom pierce rays of the King's "exquisite urbanity," last glimpses of which are his apologies to his attendants for the trouble he had caused them, having been an unconscionable time dying, which he hoped they would excuse.

So well is this anecdotal necessity understood by modern historians that possibly the less scrupulous or more imaginative among them "have drawn on their imagination for their facts." Take, for instance, the pathetic incident known as "the last night of the Girondists." Thiers, in his history of the French Revolution, is the first to describe the twenty-one victims of the Terror taking a last meal together, "at which they were by turns merry, serious, and eloquent. Their leader, Vergniaud, spoke of expiring liberty in the noblest terms of regret, Ducos repeated verses which he had composed in prison, and they all joined in singing hymns to France and liberty." In the hands of the poetic Lamartine this simple repast becomes a feast of Lucullus with "the daintiest meats, the choicest wines, the rarest flowers, and numerous *flambeaux*, the luxury of the last farewell, the prodigality of dying men, who have nothing to save for the next day." The nephew of one of the Girondists unnecessarily protests against lending to them a sensuality that was neither in their habits nor to their tastes,—unnecessarily, because no such meal, repast, or banquet took place; for their companion, Riouffe, who passed the night with them and survived them, says that, when they returned to prison at a late hour from the tribunal where they had been condemned to perish the next morning, "they passed all this frightful night in singing patriotic songs, only interrupted by talk of the country or by a sally of Ducos."

No biographer can afford to neglect the illustration and anecdotes of everyday life, for they may serve his purpose more successfully than the most elaborate analysis. Without the use of anecdote it is, therefore, impossible to attempt biography, and when a biographer mentions a peculiar characteristic, an anecdote may justify his statement and confirm its accuracy. Thus one may read that Adam Smith was remarkably absent-minded. No one will doubt this when told that once having to sign his name to an official document the great economist produced, not his own signature, but an elaborate imitation of the signature of the person who signed before him; and that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on another occasion, a sentinel on duty having saluted him in military style was astonished to see him acknowledge it by an awkward copy of the same gestures. Busch, the Boswellian biographer of Bismarck, says that the Chancellor is of a choleric disposition. The least vexation is liable to provoke him to volcanic outbursts of temper, but the eruption rapidly subsides. He tells no confirmatory anecdotes, but Count Beust comes to his rescue, saying in his "Memoirs" that Bismarck once left the Emperor's apartment in a rage, and, finding that he was carrying by accident the key with him, he threw it into a basin in a friend's room, and broke the basin into fragments. "Are you ill?" asked the occupant of the room. "I was," replied Bismarck, "but I am better now." His passionate outbursts stand in strong contrast with Moltke's imperturbable coolness, which is well illustrated by the story in which Bismarck himself tells that, at a critical moment of the battle of Sadowa, he offered the great strategist a cigar, and Moltke carefully selected the best one in the case. Bismarck says he took comfort in thinking that if the great general was calm enough to make a choice of this kind, things could not be going so very badly with them.

Who has not heard of Macaulay's insatiate love of reading and of the prodigious memory which enabled him to pour forth at will the vast treasures of his learning? We appreciate the former when told that during his childhood, from the age of three years, he read incessantly, for the most part lying on the rug before the fire, with the book on the floor and a piece of bread and butter in his hand. It was hardly necessary for his biographer to add that he did not care for toys. He who speaks of Macaulay's prodigious learning and memory may single out the following anecdote from the many which illustrate it: Lady Holland, to puzzle him, once said: "Pray, sir, what was the origin of a doll? Where are dolls first mentioned in history?" To which he instantly replied that the Roman children had their dolls, which they offered up to Venus when they grew older, to support which he quoted a line from Persius.

We gain a more distinct view of Talleyrand's duplicity when told that, at Erfurt, where Napoleon met the Emperor of Russia to persuade him to join in overwhelming Austria, Talleyrand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, who all day long labored under Napoleon's vigilant eye to carry this object, used to visit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alexander secretly at night and furnish him with every argument, reason, or pretence, which he could discover or invent against Napoleon's plan. Talleyrand himself told this to Croker, who repeats it in his memoirs.

All men, according to Napoleon, lose on a near view. He himself is no exception to his own rule, and the Napoleonic myth has been rudely shattered by the publication of memoirs filled with anecdotes which disclose the petulance, the rudeness, the ungovernable temper and uncurbed passions, the jealousy, meanness and mendacity of the conqueror of Europe. Chateaubriand, who wrote "The Genius of Christianity," was a man of impure conversation, and Young, the author of religious poems once popular, was a time-serving, place-hunting parson, "not at all the man of his own poetry."

But, on the other hand, men like to read of the weaknesses of the great, who are thus reduced to the level of mankind. This, fortunately, does not extend to fatal lapses from integrity, or calamities of fortune. The world will always offer to the blind Belisarius the obolus he is said to have begged at the city's gate. We would rather sit with Marius among the ruins of Carthage than with Tiberius on the rock of Capri. We accompany Aristides in his banishment, and join in the shouts which welcome Cicero's return from exile. We grieve to see Smollett perishing in a foreign land without resources from the works on which his publishers grew rich. We are touched by the sight of Cervantes lying in a dungeon and Camoëns yielding up his miserable life in a hospital.

Anecdotes may elevate as well as depress our opinion of men otherwise great. The well-known story of Goldsmith slipping into the mattress when he had given his blankets to the impoverished mother of five young children is matched by that of Lessing, in the depth of his poverty at Wolfenbüttel, taking home and supporting a man and a dog whom he had found starving on the highway. The weakness of much of Goldsmith's conduct is palliated, and our idea of the nobility of Lessing's character is heightened by these anecdotes which touch the heart of mankind.

We are by anecdotes made more nearly contemporaneous with great men than were most of their contemporaries. We are of the same time as the heroes of Plutarch, and have sat at the feet of Socrates and Plato. Demosthenes practising oratory with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pebbles seems hardly more remote from us than young Gambetta shouting his seditious eloquence in a café of the Latin Quarter. In fact, our idea of certain men is confined to slight incidents or personal anecdotes. We never think of Diogenes without his tub, nor of Robert the Bruce without his spider. Even Alfred the Great is better known to us tending the cakes than founding Oxford.

Addison observes in the opening pages of the "Spectator" that a reader seldom peruses a book with pleasure until he knows "whether the writer be a black or a fair man, of a mild or choleric disposition, with other particulars of a like nature, that conduce very much to the right understanding of an author." He is careful, therefore, to give a detailed description of himself, and his remark is so just, even at this distance of time and space, that one can hardly open a daily newspaper without reading of a popular novelist like Tolstoi, that "he is a man of sixty, with iron-gray hair parted in the middle, sunburnt countenance, and ample gray beard and moustache." We also like to know the history and occasion of a literary work. We have not yet ceased to hear the chanting of the monks in the church of the Ara Cœli, which inspired Gibbon with the idea of writing "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." "The Vicar of Wakefield" is more interesting to us when we are told that it rescued its author from arrest for debt, while "Rasselas" paid the funeral expenses of the author's mother. This interest in authors extends to their literary habits, and the scrupulous biographer will tell us that Buffon sat down to write with lace ruffles encircling his wrists; that Blackstone wrote his Commentaries with a bottle of port wine before him, and that Handel, as he daily took up the composition of the "Messiah," offered a prayer that he might worthily sing the praises of his Redeemer.

Anecdotes and the sayings of distinguished men illuminate such diverse characteristics as modesty, self-confidence and self-conceit. When Marshal Ney was ordered to await Lannes in storming the heights above Ulm, he exclaimed, "Glory is not to be divided!" and pushed on alone. General Grant would never have said that, for, when he was made general-in-chief, he wrote to General Sherman: "How far your execution of whatever has been given you to do entitles you to the reward I am receiving, you cannot know so well as I." Jefferson's modesty dictated his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reply to the welcome extended to him as Minister from the United States by the French Foreign Secretary: "You replace Mr. Franklin," said Vergennes. "I succeed him," answered the American Envoy, "no one could replace him." Pitt's generosity was equalled by his modesty, when he said of one of Fox's speeches, "Don't disparage it; nobody could have made it but himself;" and Burke thought it glory enough to have "rung the bell" to Dr. Johnson. It was not merely the desire to turn a compliment which prompted Dom Pedro of Brazil to enter Victor Hugo's *salon* with the words: "Reassure me, Sir, I am somewhat timid." It was the humility of royalty before genius, the humility of Charles V. picking up Titian's brush, or of Philip IV. proud of having painted a decoration in a portrait of Velasquez.

A confidence in one's own powers need not pass the limits of modesty, nor will the biographer mistake it for arrogance or conceit. When Burns turned up the mouse with his plowshare, his impulse was to kill it, but, checking himself, he said: "I'll make that mouse immortal." Thackeray's fervor and hearty frankness are pleasantly shown in his saying of a passage in "Vanity Fair:" "When I wrote that sentence I slapped my fist on the table and said, 'that's a touch of genius.'"

There is a self-confidence, which is modest and yet wins battles. General Taylor once called a council of war in face of the Mexicans, who were much his superiors in men and artillery. When an unanimous opinion had been given against fighting, the General quietly remarked, "I dismiss this council until after the battle," which he won.

Although it may be difficult in all cases to set the boundary between self-confidence and conceit, the following anecdotes reveal an amusing self-assurance: Some young students made a pilgrimage from Göttingen to Hamburg, where Klopstock was living in his old age, to ask the author of the "Messiah" the meaning of a passage in one of his works which they could not understand. He looked at it, and said that he could not then recollect what he meant when he wrote it, but he knew it was the finest thing he ever wrote, and they could not do better than to devote their lives to the discovery of its meaning. "When I used to go and sit with Mr. Rogers," says Mrs. Kemble, "I never asked him what I should read to him without his putting into my hands his own poems, which always lay by him on the table."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wordsworth quoted no poetry but his own, and thought that if he had had "a mind to" he could have written Shakespeare's plays, which led Lamb to suggest that only the mind was lacking.

A felicitous phrase or a happy comparison may hit off character better than a page of elaborate description. At the moment of the elder Dumas's greatest literary productivity, Michelet said of him: "He is not a man; he is one of the forces of nature." No other comparison could make Frenchmen shudder as Mme. de Staël's characterization of Bonaparte as "Robespierre on horseback." Carlyle dubbed the latter "the sea-green incorruptible," but the sourness, jealousy, and deathly cunning of the man are summed up in the comparison which Louis Philippe, who saw him sitting silent at a dinner-party, made of him to a cat lapping vinegar. We do not protest when Carlyle calls Byron "a dandy of sorrows," or Bulwer "a dandiacal philosophist," for the former phrase packs into a nutshell Byron's affected and drawing-room misanthropy, and the second paints the "lisping, slender and effeminate tones of Bulwer," of whom a contemporary said that the novelist's idea of a wife or mistress was a woman "who would sit on a foot-stool at his feet, looking up proudly in his face, and only interrupting him to whisper that he was the handsomest creature on earth." The well-known traits which gave Bishop Wilberforce the nick-name of "Soapy Sam" are alluded to in a comparison which the late Sir F. Pollock made after hearing him reply at a public dinner to a distinguished foreign guest, that the Bishop reminded him of the dealing of a boa constrictor with a rabbit. He first oiled his antagonist all over, and then swallowed him whole at a mouthful.

The absence of the anecdotal element in the record of some men's lives makes them but the shadows of names. Livy draws a graphic picture of Hannibal, but it is only in outline; it needs the filling up of anecdotes to give it life. We may believe him when he says that there never was a genius more fitted for the two most opposing duties of obeying and commanding, and also when he speaks of the great Carthaginian's fearlessness, his ability to endure fatigue, heat or cold, want of food or sleep, and his simplicity of dress; but when are added excessive vices, inhuman cruelty, want of truthfulness, of reverence for the gods and sacred things, of respect for oaths, and of a sense of religion, without confirmatory anecdotes, we may regard this summing up as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pedigree of a hostile partisan rather than the judgment of a judicious historian. To Juvenal's question, "Weigh Hannibal; how many pounds will you find in that consummate general?" the answer comes, he is one of the scarecrows of history. "Hannibal is at the gates!" has been a cry of terror since Cannæ.

For want of anecdotal illustration Dante wanders like a ghost through the corridors of history. Carlyle says that his biography is irrevocably lost to us, "an unimportant, wandering, sorrow-stricken man; not much note was taken of him while he lived, and the most of that has vanished." Coleridge regretted that no friend of Rabelais had left an authentic account of him: "There never was a more plausible, and never, I am convinced, a less appropriate line, than Pope's 'Rabelais laughing in his easy chair.' Beyond doubt he was amongst the deepest as well as the boldest thinkers of his age."

Coming to our own time, Calhoun is hardly more than a name and an idea. Of him, as a man, very little is to be told. The Calhoun of the political stage, says Holst, his most recent biographer, "the Calhoun who ate and drank like other mortals, who laughed, chatted and sorrowed, who enjoyed life and battled with its great and small cares, is dead, and no one will be able to recall him to life, in the sense in which Webster and Clay still are and will remain and live as long as the American people cherish the memory of their great men." We have no anecdotes of the great Nullifier, the cast-iron man, as Miss Martineau calls him, "who looks as if he had never been born."

If anecdote plays so important a part in biography, and gives to history some of its most entertaining instruction, if our estimate of men is largely made up of little illustrative facts, it is important that these illustrations be correct, or our deductions from them will be wrong. "The disposition," says Froude, speaking of a certain scandal attaching to Julius Cæsar, "to believe evil of men who have risen a few degrees above their contemporaries is a feature of human nature as common as it is base; and when to envy there are added fear and hatred malicious anecdotes spring up like mushrooms in a forcing-pit." Anecdotes should therefore be used with truthfulness, discretion and good taste.

S. Arthur Bent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOMESTEAD STRIKE.

I. A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM C. OATES, CHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

HOMESTEAD is a very comfortable-looking, neat little town of 10,000 to 12,000 inhabitants, situated on the left bank of the Monongahela River, seven miles east of the city of Pittsburg. Its inhabitants are chiefly laborers and mechanics of various degrees of skill, from the highest down to the ordinary laborer, with a competent number of small merchants and tradespeople. About one-half of the population are of foreign birth and represent various European nationalities.

About one mile up the river from the heart of the town are located the Homestead Works of Carnegie, Phipps & Co., the cost of which, exclusive of the ground, is near $6,000,000. At these works they manufacture structural materials used largely in fireproof buildings, such as beams, channels, etc. They also manufacture steel armor plates for use in the construction of war vessels. The 119-inch mill at which these plates are finished is one of the best of its kind in the world. The armor plate for the new Cruisers 9 and 10 now being constructed is manufactured here. The Navy Department has a contract with this company for 6,000 tons of armor plate to be used in the construction of our new war vessels. They also manufacture at Homestead all kinds of plate and do a general miscellaneous business.

Up to the last of June there were employed in these works about 3,800 men, including a number of boys. The pay-roll showed a disbursement for the month of May alone of something over $200,000. Wages have been from 14 cents per hour to the common laborer, that being the lowest, up to $280 per month (which was the highest paid in the month of May), a majority of the skilled laborers receiving $200 and less.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While the Carnegie company under its present management has been exacting, it has also performed many acts of liberality and kindness to its employees. It has at times loaned money to some of them to purchase lots and build their homes, for the use of which it has charged them but 6 per cent. interest. It receives from them deposits upon which it pays them 6 per cent. interest, the aggregate amount of which the last of June was $140,000.

On July 1, 1889, the company through its officers made a contract with a number of skilled workmen, through the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, to run for three years, or until the 30th of June, 1892.

The basis of that contract was a certain sum per ton of the products in different mills, and $25 per ton as the minimum price for 4 × 4 Bessemer steel billets, with a sliding scale so that if the market price of billets went above that figure the workmen would get the benefit of the rise; if the market price fell below $25 per ton, the compensation of the workmen would not be less than the minimum. When this contract was about to expire, the company, through its President and chief manager, Mr. Frick, and its chief superintendent, Mr. Potter, submitted a proposition to the workmen, which proposed a reduction of the minimum to $22 per ton of steel billets; also a reduction in some of the departments of the amount of tonnage rate paid; also to change the time of the year when the contract should expire, from the 30th of June to the last day of December.

After considerable negotiation the company proposed to raise the minimum to $23 per ton, and the workmen offered to take $24—which was refused. The workmen also refused to accede to the proposed change in the time of the expiration of the contract, on the ground that the company would have them at a disadvantage in any renewal of contract which would expire in midwinter. The negotiations were broken off on the 24th of June.

Mr. Frick, who is a very intelligent and shrewd business man, gives as his chief reasons for the proposition to reduce the wages of his employees:

First, That the price of steel billets, blooms, slabs, etc., has fallen to such a figure in the market that, in justice to his company, the minimum should be reduced (or abolished, as there was no maximum); and,

Secondly, That the improved machinery put in some of the mills

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since the contract of 1889 doubles the output of the finished product with no increase in the number of laborers, which very greatly increases their tonnage compensation. This latter point is contested by the workmen and explained in several ways, so it would require an expert to pass a perfectly intelligent and just judgment upon the point. Mr. Frick testified before the Congressional Committee that his company has lost money this year, and he thinks the greater part of last year, on every ton of slabs, billets and blooms produced and sold by them. He claims that the McKinley law has nothing to do with this question; that it reduced the duties on all products, the like of which he manufactures, and still these are practically prohibitory, as the diminished amounts of importations clearly proves. He attributes the fall in price to increased domestic production.

In 1874 there were produced in the United States but 91,000 tons of steel ingots, whereas in 1890 the total production was 4,131,000 tons.

Our protective tariff laws, which destroy foreign competition, it is claimed, are enacted for the benefit of the skilled laborers employed by the manufacturers. The advocates of the McKinley tariff law during its consideration proclaimed its purpose to be to give the American market to the American manufacturer, and thereby to enable him pay his laborers higher wages. These promises have not been faithfully kept. Wages have in no case been increased, but in many instances they have been reduced. The promises made to the operatives have been disappointing. Mr. Frick claims that over-production has caused a most remarkable decline in prices within the last three years, and that this makes it necessary for the Carnegie company to reduce expenses.

The high protection extended by Congress to manufacturers, principally on such articles as this company has been manufacturing, has induced the investment of capital in the manufacture of iron and steel, until by this unnatural stimulus over-production has resulted. It disturbs the laws of trade—of supply and demand—and by thus producing more than there is a demand for, prices are driven down and a necessity is created for cutting down the expenses of the manufacturer, and it may be the wages of labor included. In this way the protective tariff disappoints the laboring man and becomes the parent of trusts, combines, strikes and lockouts. The manufacturer, no more than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laborer, can help it, though he is largely responsible for it. He asks Congress for the protection he receives and must bear the consequences. It disturbs and disappoints labor, while professing to protect and foster it. After the breaking off of negotiations on the 24th of June a feeling of estrangement rapidly developed between the employees at Homestead and the officers of the Carnegie company. Messrs. Frick and Potter were hanged in effigy within the works. On the 30th of June the works were closed. On July 1st the striking workmen congregated about the gates and stopped and persuaded the foremen and employees who came to enter to go away. An advisory committee of fifty was raised from the Amalgamated Association. The watchmen of the company were turned away from the works; guards were placed at all the entrances thereto, the river, streets and roads entering the town were patrolled by guards, and a rigid surveillance exercised over those who entered the town or approached the works.

When the sheriff came on the 4th of July and demanded to put deputies of his own selection in possession of the works, to guard them for the company, his request was declined, the striking workmen proposing to place guards of their own and give indemnity for the safety of the property, but this the sheriff declined because it would enable them to keep non-union men whom the company might employ from taking the places lately held by the strikers. On the 5th of July, when the sheriff sent twelve deputies to take possession of the works, they were not allowed to do so and were driven away.

As early as about the 20th of June Mr. Frick began negotiations with Robert A. Pinkerton, of New York, for the employment of 300 watchmen to be placed in the works at Homestead. On the 25th he wrote a letter to Pinkerton giving instructions as to the movements of the guards, who were to rendezvous at Ashtabula, O., and from thence to be transported by rail to Youngstown, and from thence to be transported by boat up the river and landed in the works at Homestead.

Arms and ammunition for the men were sent in goods boxes from Chicago by William A. Pinkerton, according to the direction of Mr. Frick, and placed on Captain Rodgers's boats at Allegheny. On the evening of the 5th of July Captain Rodgers' boats, with Deputy Sheriff Gray, Superintendent Potter and some of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assistants on board, dropped down the river with two barges in tow, until they met the Pinkerton men, who were embarked on the barges. The boats took the barges in tow, and on the way up one of the steamers became disabled, while the other took both barges, endeavoring to land at Homestead before day, when the people would be asleep and the strikers would likely know nothing of it until after the Pinkerton men were safely within the picket fence surrounding the works. They did not violate any law of Pennsylvania; but they knew that the hostility to the Pinkerton men upon the part of all labor organizations was calculated to produce a breach of the peace.

The greatest mistake made by Mr. Frick was that he did not appeal to the State and county authorities for protection in the first instance. He began to negotiate for the employment of the Pinkerton forces before the negotiations for the re-employment of the workmen were broken off. His company had a legal right to put Pinkerton men or any other employees into the works at Homestead as guards or otherwise, provided in doing so it did not trespass upon the rights of person or property of others. It is but fair to say that this he tried to avoid. The Pinkertons are professional detectives, and guards or watchmen, and in the latter capacity may properly be characterized as a sort of private police or semi-military force.

Mr. Frick should have first appealed to the sheriff of his county for protection. He gave as a reason why he did not, his want of confidence in the efficiency of the sheriff and the deputies he would likely have employed. The sheriff may be a very inefficient officer and lacking in that pluck and energy that is so essential at times to be exercised by an executive officer, but had Mr. Frick and his learned attorneys urged the sheriff and aided him by their counsel, although his efforts in the discharge of his duty were but puerile and futile, if the officers of the Carnegie company had joined him in the appeal to the Governor, and Mr. Frick had gone to him in person and laid the facts before him, there is no doubt that Governor Pattison would, as he finally did do in obedience to a sense of official duty, have supplied a sufficient force to enable the sheriff to take possession and deliver the works to the officers of the company, to the end that they might operate them in whatever way they saw proper.

Men of wealth and capital, as well as the poor mechanics and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laborers in this country, must learn to respect the law and the legally constituted authorities, and have recourse to these to redress their wrongs and obtain their rights in preference to undertaking to do these things by private or personal instrumentalities. If men of wealth and corporations may with impunity hire guards in great numbers to perform the functions of the county and State officials in protecting property and preserving the peace, its inevitable effect will be to bring local government and civil authority into contempt.

When Capt. Rodgers's boat with the barges in tow was approaching Homestead, just as day was breaking, a small steamer used by the strikers for patrol purposes set up a whistle, which was responded to by all the engines in town under their control. This caused a crowd to at once assemble along the bank of the river, where it kept pace with the boat, discharging firearms. When the crowd on shore reached the fence around the works they were temporarily halted, but tearing down a part of it they rushed through. A part of the crowd on the shore came down near to the boat when the gang-plank was pushed out. A short war of words was followed by firing on each side, which resulted ultimately in the death of three of the Pinkerton men and seven of the workmen, and the wounding of many on each side. After a brief fusillade those on shore fled in various directions, and the Pinkerton men retreated into their barges. An hour or two later, after having made the barges fast to the wharf, Capt. Rodgers took the wounded upon his boat, and with Superintendent Potter and Deputy Sheriff Gray steamed up the river to take the wounded to a hospital. About 11 o'clock the boat returned, the deputy sheriff still on board. He said that it was his intention to tow the barges and the Pinkerton men away, but the boat received a heavy fire from the striking workmen with small arms and artillery from both sides of the river. One or two of her crew were either killed or severely wounded, and at one time the pilot for safety abandoned his post and let the steamer drift, so that it became impossible for her to take the barges in tow, and with great difficulty it ran the gauntlet of the fire and escaped to Pittsburg.

At this time the strikers on shore were endeavoring to use a piece of artillery upon the barges, but they could not depress it sufficiently and consequently fired over them. They also poured oil into the river above the barges and set it on fire, but this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed of its purpose, because the water in the river is slack at this point and the wind was blowing up instead of down the river. About five o'clock in the afternoon the Pinkertons displayed a white flag, and negotiated terms of surrender, by which they were allowed to take out their clothing, but their arms and everything else fell into the possession of the Homestead people. The barges were immediately set on fire and burned, and in their burning the pump-house belonging to the Carnegie company was also destroyed. The Pinkerton men now being practically prisoners of war, were marched up town to the skating rink for temporary imprisonment, and on their way, instead of receiving that protection which Mr. Hugh O'Donnell, the chairman of the Advisory Committee, in negotiating the terms of surrender had promised, they were brutally and outrageously maltreated. The injuries inflicted upon them, in some cases, were indecent as well as brutal. Whether these men were of good or bad character, the offence which they had committed against the feelings of the people of Homestead could in no degree justify the indignities with which they were treated.

The sheriff was notified and that night came down and took the prisoners away, informed Governor Pattison of what hadtranspired, and called upon him again for troops to enforce law and order, to which the Governor responded, as his duty under the law required.

I think that Mr. Frick, like many other manufacturers, is not infatuated with labor organizations, and hence is opposed to the Amalgamated Association and its methods, and had no very great desire to contract with his workmen through that organization. This was the true reason why he appeared to them as autocratic and uncompromising in his demands. They claim that he was too stern, brusque and autocratic to reason with them and hear their arguments. If the business of his company, on account of a fall in the market price of the products of the works, required a reduction of the wages of the employees, he should have appealed to their reason and shown them the true state of the company's affairs. I am persuaded that if he had done so an agreement would have been reached and all the troubles which followed would thus have been avoided.

Secret political organizations are inconsistent with our American republican system of government, because the public at large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has the right of participation in all matters pertaining to government. Laborers, farmers, and men engaged in any business, have the right to organize for their mutual benefit and protection, and even though their organization be secret that constitutes no objection if it is non-political. But no organization of laborers or others has the right of enforcing its wishes or the decrees of its councils by strong hand, setting at defiance the rights of others, or by violations of the law.

I have no doubt that the Amalgamated Association, which is, as I understand it, non-political, may be very useful to its members in many ways if properly limited and directed. While I do not assume it as to this association, there is such a thing as over-organization, to the extent of making the members thereof zealots, and then its unreasonable demands, like a boomerang in its rebound, injure its devotees more than the blow injures the supposed enemy at whom it is aimed, and in this way its usefulness is greatly impaired or destroyed.

The right of any man to labor, upon whatever terms he and his employer agree, whether he belong to a labor organization or not, and the right of a person or corporation (which in law is also a person) to employ any one to labor in a lawful business is secured by the laws of the land.

In this free country these rights must not be denied or abridged. To do so would destroy that personal freedom which has ever been the just pride and boast of American citizens. Even the "moral suasion" which the members of labor organizations may use to prevent non-union men from accepting employment must not be carried too far or it may become intimidation and coercion, and hence be unlawful. We must recognize the fact that in this country every man is the architect of his own fortune. A denial or obstruction of this right should not be tolerated, palliated, or excused. Our entire system of government, State and Federal, is based upon the idea of the individual right of every citizen to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is not the business of government to aid anyone in the acquisition of property, but it is the business of governments and their duty, each acting within its sphere, to protect the citizen, the humblest as well as the most autocratic, in the enjoyment of the right to his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Not to make property for him, nor to furnish him the opportunity of making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it, but to amply protect him in his lawful efforts to make it and to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

Congress has, from time to time, arrogated to itself the right to legislate in a manner and upon subjects of which it can properly have no jurisdiction, until the people have become educated to the idea that its powers to legislate are unlimited, and hence, whatever occurs that is deemed an evil, Congress is at once appealed to by thousands for a legislative remedy or relief. It is a familiar principle enunciated by every respectable commentator upon the constitution, and decided many times by the Supreme Court of the United States, that the powers of Congress must be sought alone in some express grant in the constitution, or be found necessary to carry into effect such powers as are therein granted; and that the states have exclusive jurisdiction of all local matters.

Congress, therefore, has no power to interfere by legislation in the labor troubles at Homestead, nor in any similar ones which may subsequently occur there or elsewhere. A voluntary arbitration law was passed by Congress, applicable to railroad strikes, and there is also one in Pennsylvania applicable to her own affairs, but neither of them is of any practical utility. Parties will not have recourse to that method of settlement, and there is no way to enforce the award when rendered.

Nor is a compulsory arbitration law practicable. Such a law could only be enacted by the State, and compulsory arbitration would be no arbitration at all, since it would at once be the exercise of judicial power.

Courts can afford remedy for violated contracts, but in a case like that at Homestead, where the parties fail to agree,—where they fail to make a contract,—if the State could invest a tribunal with authority to step in and say that the proposition of the Carnegie Company was reasonable and that the striking workmen should accept it and go to work, thus making for them a contract which they refused to make, and the workmen did not choose to obey the award, how could it be enforced?

No legislative authority can deprive any man of the right to contract in respect to his own private property or labor and without his consent confer that power upon another person or tribunal His discretion and personal right cannot be thus taken from him, for that would at once destroy his freedom.

The rights of property and personal liberty are secured by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fundamental laws of the state and nation, just as they were by the English common law and Magna Charta, which the old barons, sword in hand, wrested from King John, at Runnymede.

The legislature of every state should be diligent in enacting wise, conservative and just laws for the protection of both labor and capital, so that demagogues may have a narrower field for agitation. Unless something of this kind be done, within the next decade we may reasonably expect a revolution and bloodshed which may work a change in the form of our government. Laboring men and poor people generally are much more interested in preventing this calamity than are the rich. The poor man derives but little benefit from a strong government, which would be the probable outcome of revolution.

Congress can contribute much towards allaying agitation by repealing all class legislation and greatly restricting foreign immigration.

WM. C. OATES.

II. A CONSTITUTIONAL VIEW.

BY GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

THE editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has requested me to give my opinion on "the legality of the employment of Pinkerton detectives in such cases as the Homestead strike." The inquiry relates to other cases similar in all material respects to the recent occurrences at Homestead, in Pennsylvania. It also involves the relations of employers and employed in all similar branches of manufactures; the relations between the owners of mills, factories, etc., and the workmen whom they employ. A great deal has been written on the relations of capital and labor, and written to very little purpose. It is, however, not difficult to define the rights of property owners or capitalists on the one hand, and of workmen on the other; nor is it difficult to determine what society—by which I mean the legislative power—owes to each of them respectively.

The matter of the Homestead strike has been very much simplified by the statement made by the Messrs. Pinkerton on the 22d of July to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate. It appears that for the past twenty years what is called the Pinkerton agency has been a private concern, which has furnished detectives for the discovery of crime, and watchmen to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guard the property of individuals and corporations during strikes. The men who have been so employed were not public officers or officers of the law, unless in a particular case they were made so by some public authority. They were like any other private individuals employed as watchmen to protect private property from the violence of a mob, from burglars, or any similar danger. They had the same rights of self-defence and the same right of defending the property of their employers.

Homestead is a borough on the Allegheny River, ten miles from Pittsburg. It contains about 10,000 inhabitants. Most of the male inhabitants are employed in one capacity or another, either as skilled or unskilled laborers, in the iron and steel manufacturing establishments. Their wages were exceptionally high. There exists among them, as there exists elsewhere, what is called a "trades-union." This is a body of workmen banded together for the purpose, among other things, of keeping up the price of labor, and, by means of a strike, of coercing their employers, when the latter do not accede to their terms. A strike is a concerted and sudden cessation of work at a given signal or order, issued by the authority of the union, in whom the power to issue it is vested by the members. Sometimes this authority is a single individual; sometimes it is an advisory committee. In all cases, when a strike is ordered, work ceases at once, to the great injury of employers and employed.

In the Homestead case, the existing agreement between the Carnegie Steel Company and their workmen about wages, had run out. Mr. Frick, the managing agent of the company, had an interview with the men, and offered a new scale of wages. This the men refused to accept. Mr. Frick then closed the mills. After this the workmen seized the mills, excluded the owners from their property by an overwhelming force, and prevented the employment of non-union men. Obviously, it was indispensable that something should be done to restore law and order, and to reinstate the owners of the mills in their property. The local officer of the law, whose duty it was to do this, was the sheriff of Allegheny County. His means consisted only of special deputy sheriffs appointed from the citizens at large, and sworn in as a temporary and extemporized force. In a population consisting largely of the striking workmen and their sympathizers, a force adequate to do what had to be done could not be obtained.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thereupon the Carnegie Steel Company applied to the Pinkerton agency for a body of watchmen to protect their property. The agency refused to supply the men unless they should be sworn in as deputy sheriffs before going to Homestead. The account runs:

"The agency was then assured that the sheriff of Allegheny County knew that the men were going to Homestead to act as watchmen to guard the property of the company, and that the sheriff had promised immediately upon any outbreak or disturbance to deputize all the Pinkerton watchmen as deputy sheriffs. On that condition only the agency consented to furnish about 300 watchmen. A large number of these were regular employees of the agency, who could be thoroughly trusted for integrity, prudence and sobriety. The sheriff's chief deputy, Gray, accompanied the men."*

The men were sent down the Allegheny River on barges. It is immaterial whether there is or is not a law of Pennsylvania which prohibits the sending of a body of armed men into the State for any purpose. I understand that there is no such law in Pennsylvania, although there is such a law in some of the New England States. But the Pinkerton men were within the limits of the State before they were armed or needed to be. The boxes containing arms and ammunition were shipped from Chicago, *and were to be delivered at the Homestead yards.* These boxes, on board the barges, were not opened and the contents distributed until after the strikers had begun firing from the shore on the watchmen and it had become an evident matter of self-defence. Klein, one of the Pinkerton watchmen, had been killed by the strikers, and about five other men shot and wounded before the Pinkerton men began their fire in self-defence. Then it was impossible to shoot those firing from the shore at the barges, because the strikers had made a breastwork for themselves by placing women and children in front and firing from behind them.

The Pinkerton men were obliged to capitulate before they were allowed to land, and even then they were not permitted to go to the mills which they had been employed to protect. They were conducted by an overwhelming force of the strikers to Labor Hall, the place of meeting of the strikers. There they were made to promise to quit Homestead and never again to serve the mill owners. On their way from the hall they were insulted and brutally assailed by a mob, among whom the women were the most violent. They

* Statement of Mr. Robert Pinkerton to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, July 22, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were withdrawn from the State by the agency, and thus the whole object for which they had been employed was prevented.

Under these circumstances, the sheriff of Allegheny County applied to the Governor of the State for a military force. The Governor declined to order out any of the troops of the State, until the sheriff had exhausted his means of restoring law and order by the appointment of special deputies. The sheriff made an ineffectual effort to do this, but the citizens responded in such few numbers that it would have been idle to rely on the civil arm alone. When the Governor was officially informed of this, he ordered out the entire division of the State militia, about 6,000 men, under General Snowden, a capable, prudent and experienced officer. The troops were marched to Homestead, and encamped on a hill that overlooks the town. It is only necessary to say, concerning this part of the history, that at the time at which I am writing there is every prospect that the strike will be completely put down, and thus the State of Pennsylvania will have rendered a great service to the whole country, employers and employed, capitalists and laborers.

On the indubitable facts of the Homestead case, which I have taken great pains to gather from authentic sources, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion, as follows:

First, That the owners of the mills had a perfect legal right to employ any necessary number of men to defend their property.

Secondly, That all the acts of the Pinkerton men at Homestead were lawful; and that, as watchmen, they had a right to bear arms on the premises of the Carnegie company in order to protect life and property, whether they were or were not deputized by the sheriff of Allegheny County; and that the agency had the right to ship arms for such purposes from Chicago to the Carnegie yards at Homestead; and that, in view of the attack on the barges, the watchmen had the right to bear arms and defend themselves; and that all their acts in firing in self-defence from the barges after the attack on them were legally justifiable under the laws of the United States and the State of Pennsylvania.

Thirdly, That the killing of Klein by one or more of the riotous strikers was a murder.

Fourthly, That all who stood by, sympathizing with and encouraging the strikers, or not exerting themselves to prevent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the strikers who were armed from firing on the barges, were accessories to the murder.

Having thus answered the question that was propounded to me, I shall devote the remainder of the space allotted for this article to the consideration of the duty of the legislative power in the States of this Union in reference to the whole subject of strikes. The stake that society has in all branches of manufacturing industries and in all the great lines of communication and travel is too vast to permit any body of men, large or small, on any pretext, to put a sudden stop to production, or to cause a sudden paralysis in the system of daily and hourly intercourse between different communities.

Unfortunately, there is one embarrassing difficulty. Whenever such a disturbance as that at Homestead occurs, politicians at once endeavor to turn it to the advantage of their political party; and men in high places, who ought to be ashamed of themselves, are often found encouraging the strikers, for the purpose of making what is called "political capital." Mr. Carnegie happens to be a Republican in politics, and his works at Homestead are an eminent instance of the beneficial effect of a protective tariff on the interests of American manufacturers and American laborers. For this reason, Democratic papers and politicians of free trade proclivities take the side of the strikers and endeavor to excite hatred of Mr. Carnegie and his business associates. On the other hand, some Republican papers and politicians are prone to charge the Democratic executive of Pennsylvania with pusillanimous hesitation because he did not at once respond to the call of the sheriff of Allegheny County. Whether we shall ever be entirely free from this disturbing element of politics in reference to this matter of strikes, is problematical. But it is certain that the duty of society remains the same.

The first duty of the legislative power is to emancipate the individual workman from the tyranny of his class. Unless this be done, capitalists can afford no aid to the solution of any labor problem whatever. Of what avail is it that a mill owner or a railroad company is willing to make fair terms with workmen if the state of things is such that they cannot employ whom they please, on such terms as will be agreed to by the men who want employment? It is only by making the individual laborer a perfectly free man that society can do its duty to him and to those who wish to buy his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor for a price that he is willing to take, and which it is for the interest of those who are dependent upon him to have him take.

In opposition to this view, it will be said that the individual workman is a free agent now, and that if he choose to join a trades-union and bind himself not to work for wages less than what the union permits him to take, it is his own affair; he is acting in his own right. There is a wide distinction between the physical power to do a thing and the moral and legal right to do it. Men have the physical power to commit suicide, but society does not allow that they have a moral or a legal right to do it. On the same principle, the individual workman should not be allowed to commit moral suicide by surrendering his liberty to the control of his fellow workmen. His labor is his capital, all that he has in the world, all that he and his family have to depend upon for subsistence from day to day. It is to him and them what money invested in real estate, machinery, etc., is to the capitalist. Deprive the capitalist of the power to determine what remuneration he shall derive from the employment of his invested money, and you do the same wrong as when you deprive the laborer of the free power to determine what remuneration he will be content to take for the employment of his capital, which consists of his muscular power and his acquired skill.

These doctrines may not be popular. They may not meet at once with universal acceptance. But until they are accepted and carried out in legislation, there can be no successful reconcilement between the interests of capital and the interests of labor; no adjustment of the rights of society and the rights of employers and employed.

In order that I may not be misunderstood, I will now draw the line between what it may and what it may not be permitted to workmen to do. Associations of workmen, formed for the purpose of discussing the subject of wages with their employers, of obtaining and diffusing information about the price of labor in different places, and of mutual assistance in time of sickness, are beneficial and should be encouraged. But the trades-unions do not confine themselves to these objects. They transcend the line which divides what they may from what they may not rightfully do. In this respect they do a double wrong:

First, They bind their members to strike when ordered to do so by the governing authority of the union. Now the right to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

renounce an employment is an individual and not a corporate right. The corporate body of a trades-union should not be permitted to bind their members to quit work, as a body, when ordered to do so by the governing authority of the association.

Secondly, The trades-unions, as most of them are now organized, prevent non-union men from getting employment, by every species of intimidation, even by personal violence, and sometimes by murder.

This coercion of non-union men, however attempted and in whatever it ends, should be made a crime, and be punished with severity. It is contrary to the fundamental principles of our institutions. The Declaration of Independence says "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Be it observed that these are individual rights; that they are inalienable by the individual himself. We should not permit a man to sell himself into slavery or to sell his own life. He cannot alienate his right to life or his right to liberty. No more should he be permitted to alienate his right to the pursuit of happiness, by giving up his power to consult his own individual welfare, in obtaining the means of happiness; and by putting it in the power of those who are engaged in the same employment to take the bread out of his mouth. We have emancipated the colored race from slavery; certain portions of our own race need emancipation from a slavery that is just as bad.

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

III. A KNIGHT OF LABOR'S VIEW.

BY T. V. POWDERLY, GENERAL MASTER WORKMAN OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR.

THE principle involved in the Homestead trouble is the same as that by which the founders of this republic were governed in rebelling against the British government. To have accepted decisions, decrees, and laws without question, and without a voice in their making, would have stamped the colonists as slaves. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accept, without inquiring the why or wherefore, such terms and wages as the Carnegie Steel Company saw fit to offer would stamp the brand of inferiority upon the workmen of Homestead. Independence is worth as much to the workingman as it can be to the employer. The right to sell his labor in the highest market is as dear to the workman as the right of the manufacturer to sell the product of that labor can possibly be to the latter. It is folly to assert that the workman has no right to a voice in determining what the minimum rate of compensation shall be. If the manufacturer is permitted to invade the market place and undersell competitors a reduction in the wages of his employees must inevitably follow. It was to protect the manufacturer as well as the workman that the Amalgamated Association insisted on a minimum rate of pay. The fixing of that rate imposed no hardship on the manufacturer; it gave no competitor the advantage over him, for the majority of mills were operated under the Amalgamated scale, and this of itself fixed a rate below which manufacturers would not sell. The minimum rate was therefore as advantageous to the manufacturer as to the workman in the steel trade. The question at issue between the Carnegie Steel Company and the steel workers does not so much concern the price as the right to a voice in fixing that price.

Individual employers no longer exist; the day no longer dawns on the employer taking his place in the shop among the men. When that condition of workshop life existed employer and employee experienced a feeling of lasting friendship for each other; the interests of each were faithfully guarded by the other. Now the employer of men may be three thousand miles away from the workshop; he may be a part of a syndicate or corporation which deals with the employees through a special agent or superintendent, whose desire to secure the confidence and good will of the corporation may cause him to create friction in order to demonstrate that he is vigilant in looking after the interests of those to whom he looks for favors. The corporation, composed of many men, is an association of capital which delegates its authority to an agent whose duty it is to deal with the workmen and make terms with them. The Amalgamated Association, and all other bodies of organized workmen, stand in the same relation to the men as the corporation does to the capitalists whose money is invested. One invests money, that is, his capital; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other invests his labor, which to him is not only his capital but his all. That the workman should have the same right to be heard through his legitimately appointed agent, the officer of the labor organization, that the corporation has to be heard through the superintendent or agent, is but equity. This is the bone of contention at Homestead, and in fact everywhere else where a labor organization attempts to guard the rights of its members.

Every law, every right, every concession which the workingmen now enjoy has come to them through the labor organization. Philanthropists have spoken honeyed words for the laboring man, but he has always been forced to knock, and knock hard, with his organization in order to take what equity would have accorded him without a struggle if greed had not entered its protest. Equality of rights is what the workmen are contesting for, and because of its immense wealth the Carnegie Steel Company denies that right. It is argued that this trouble is between the employer and the employed and that no other has the right to interfere. That is a doubtful position to take. In a store, in a small shop, or where but a few persons are interested, a strike or lockout may be said to affect only those directly engaged in it, but in the present instance the case presents a different aspect to the thoughtful person. If the great steel plant were not just where it is the town of Homestead would not be the flourishing place that it is. The establishment of that plant attracted workmen to the spot; they built homes, raised their families, and invested every dollar of their earnings there. Business men, professional men, and clergymen followed them, and a community of well-behaved, respectable citizens surrounds the steel works. The workmen by their labor made the steel works prosperous and great; on the other hand they made Homestead what it is. The men depend for their support on steady work, and the community back of them depends on their steady employment. Three parties are interested in this struggle, the Carnegie Steel Company, the employees of that concern, and the community. By community I mean the whole people. Other towns have grown up as Homestead grew, by the labor of workmen, and each one is to a certain extent interested in the welfare of the other. The articles manufactured in one place are sold in another, and a mutuality of interests exists to-day which did not, and could not, exist years ago when men required but few things

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to serve the every-day needs of life. The manager of the Carnegie Steel Company in asserting that he has the right to turn the makers of a prosperous town out of employment and out of the town,—for that naturally follows,—stands upon treacherous ground, for the makers of towns have equally as good a right to be heard as have the investors of money. If we go to a higher law than that of the land, the moral law, there will be no disputing the assertion that flesh and blood should receive more consideration than dollars and cents.

The Carnegie Steel Company and like concerns owe their prosperity to the protective laws of the United States. These laws were passed in the interest of labor. During discussion on the tariff laws it was never advanced as a reason why they should be passed, that capital would be protected,—the argument was always that labor would be protected. The workman has not been protected from foreign competition by the government. He has had to fight the battle for himself through the labor organization. Not only has he had to fight against foreign competition, largely attracted by our delusive tariff laws, but he has had to wage war with the employer for a share of that protection which his government decreed by law that he should have. Our government has enacted protective legislation in the interest of labor, if we read congressional speeches aright, but it quiescently allows the manufacturer to absorb the bulk of protection, and then throws its armies around the establishment at the slightest provocation when the workmen ask for what their government admitted that they had a right to enjoy.

What would have averted this trouble at Homestead, is asked? Industries which are protected by tariff laws should be open to inspection by government officials. When the managers of such concerns seek to absorb all of the protection the government should interfere on behalf of the workingmen. If we must have protection let us see to it that it protects the man who works.

At the hands of the law-making power of State and nation the Knights of Labor demand "the enactment of laws providing for arbitration between employers and employed, and to enforce the decision of the arbitrators." It should be a law in every State that in disputed cases the employer should be obliged to select two arbitrators and the employees two, these four to select the fifth; this arbitration commission to have access to all books, papers, and facts bearing on the question at issue from both sides. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goes without saying that the commission should be made up of reasonable, well-disposed men, and that publicity would not be given to such information as they might become possessed of.

An established board of arbitration, appointed by a governor or other authority, is simply no board of arbitration at all, for the reason that the workmen would have no voice in its selection, and the other side, having all the money and influence, would be tempted to "fix" such a board preparatory to engaging in a controversy with workingmen. For either side to refuse to appoint its arbitrators should be held to be cause for their appointment by the Governor of the State. No strike or lockout should be entered upon before the decision of the board of arbitrators. Provisions for appeal from the decision of the arbitrators should be made in order to prevent intimidation or money from influencing the board.

In no case should the introduction of an armed force, such as the Pinkerton detective agency arms and equips, be tolerated. The system which makes one man a millionaire makes tramps and paupers of thousands. The thousands go down to the brothels and slums, where they sprout the germs of anarchy and stand ready for any deed of desperation. The millionaire becomes more arrogant and unreasonable as his millions accumulate. Victimizing and blacklisting are the concomitants of the rule of industrial establishments by our millionaire "lords of industry," and these measures furnish recruits for the army of greed when organized labor enters its protest against such acts of injustice as has made tramps of other men under like circumstances. The employer who is satisfied with a reasonable profit will not fear to intrust his case to such a board of arbitrators as I have described. The employer who refuses arbitration fears for the justice of his cause. He who would acquire legitimately need not fear investigation; he who would steal must do it in the dark in order to be successful.

Those who harshly criticise the workmen of Homestead should put themselves in the place of these workmen for a few brief moments of thought. Picture the skill required to turn out faultless work, the loss of eyesight which follows a few years of toil before the seething furnace, the devotion to duty which must be shown in order to succeed. Then step outside of the mill and witness the erection of a high fence and its armament. Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sider what it means and that it is being erected before a threat has been made or a disagreement considered among the possibilities. Think of the stigma which the erection of that fence casts on the man who works, the builder of the town; and then reflect that it is being built to serve as a prison-pen for those who must work so cheap that they will not be able to erect homes or maintain families in respectability. Ponder over the fact that when cheap men take the places of well-paid men, they do not buy carpets, organs, pianos, decent, respectable furniture or raiment, and that the makers of these articles elsewhere will be thrown out of employment, and that other manufacturers will be driven to bankruptcy because of a falling off in the demand for their product. Then read what Mr. Carnegie said six short years ago in speaking of the question of employing non-union, cheap men:

"To expect that one dependent upon his daily wage for the necessaries of life will stand by peaceably and see a new man employed in his stead is to expect much. This poor man may have a wife and children dependent upon his labor. Whether medicine for a sick child, or even nourishing food for a delicate wife, is procurable, depends upon his steady employment. In all but a very few departments of labor it is unnecessary, and, I think, improper, to subject men to such an ordeal. In the case of railways and a few other employments it is, of course, essential for the public wants that no interruption occur, and in such case substitutes must be employed; but the employer of labor will find it much more to his interest, wherever possible, to allow his works to remain idle and await the result of a dispute than to employ the class of men that can be induced to take the place of other men who have stopped work. Neither the best men as men, nor the best men as workers, are thus to be obtained. There is an unwritten law among the best workmen: 'Thou shalt not take thy neighbor's job.' No wise employer will lightly lose his old employees. Length of service counts for much in many ways. Calling upon strange men should be the last resort."

The introduction of an armed body of men at the outset was an indication that some man would be expected to "take his neighbor's job," and at once. The arbitrament of the sword was the first thought with the Carnegie Steel Company. The laws of Pennsylvania were disregarded in arming citizens of other States and assigning them to duty at Homestead. In that awful spectacle to which the eyes of humanity turned on the 6th of July could be seen the final abolition of brute force in the settlement of strikes and lockouts. What the law will not do for men they must do for themselves, and by the light of the blazing guns at Homestead it was written that arbitration must take the place of "Pinkertonism."

T. V. POWDERLY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

APROPOS OF CHOLERA.

ASIATIC cholera, so called from the fact that it is a disease endemic in parts of Asia, is a malignant disease of the blood, caused by the presence in the intestines of bacilli in countless myriads. This bacillus, discovered by Koch, and named the "comma" bacillus because it resembles the comma in shape (,) increases by segmentation; that is, it divides itself into two parts, each becoming of full size and dividing again. The bacilli are given off in the discharges from the bowels, and cholera may only be caught by taking the bacilli into the mouth and stomach in some way. They are infinitely small, so small that I have no words in which to convey an idea of their lack of size. They may be carried in the dust blown about the street, but the media through which they usually reach human beings are the water drunk or the food eaten.

The spread of cholera, it being a purely infectious disease, and requiring the bacilli to be swallowed, is through the persons infected or suffering from it or through their infected clothing. How long the bacilli will remain active in a dry state is not definitely known, but for practical purposes I can say that any clothing exposed to infection is dangerous so long as the bacilli have not been killed. Cholera, like other diseases we call epidemics, spreads along the ordinary routes of travel. Each person infected becomes in turn a centre of infection for others, and the disease would therefore move from country to country like the widening circles in water were there no travel whatever. The universal movement of to-day, however, hastens its march greatly.

While cholera is endemic in Asia, and always makes its appearance during such great religious festivals as the pilgrimage to Mecca or the festival of Juggernaut, it does not travel to Europe every year. This is because the disease does not always acquire that virulence which will develop a germ of sufficient malignity to travel. Why this should be so I do not know, but all facts point to the conclusion that sometimes the germ or bacillus is of greater potency and strength than at others, and this is true of all infectious diseases.

The present outbreak appears to have had its origin at Meshed, in Persia, a resort of Mohammedan pilgrims second in importance only to Mecca. As the pilgrims dispersed they carried the disease with them, and had any country except Russia been in the line of march, cholera would have been kept out of Europe. It travelled to Baku, thence to Astrakhan, then up the Volga, infecting the cities on the bank, until it reached Nijni-Novgorod at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the time of the great fair. From there it went to Moscow. It is also approaching Europe by way of the Black Sea. The Austrian and Prussian authorities are on the alert, and have established a most rigid quarantine. It is probable, too, the disease exists in a mild form, although the distress caused by the famine in Russia will probably have the effect of intensifying its malignancy. It is doubtful whether the disease reported from Paris is cholera. I am inclined to think it is cholera morbus, which is also infectious, and therefore a germ disease.

The practical question which concerns us in this country is the danger to which we are exposed. This is not very great. In the first place the fact of the existence of the disease is known, and in such matters to be forewarned is emphatically to be forearmed. Second, the period of incubation of cholera is very short, being from a few hours to three days. Consequently, should any person infected board one of the ships coming here the disease would manifest itself before the arrival of the vessel. The advantage of this is obvious; no vessel could arrive here with cholera on board without the quarantine physicians finding or hearing of cases. The outbreak of typhus which occurred in the city some months ago was produced by people who, owing to the long incubation of typhus, passed quarantine while apparently well. Of course, the germs might come here in rags, but the chances that rags have of passing without disinfection are extraordinarily small nowadays. Third, to confine myself to New York City, the water supply is at present very good. The water shed of the Croton is uncontaminated now, and will remain so until the population becomes much denser. Ultimately New York must get its water elsewhere, for, should the water shed of the Croton become densely settled, typhoid fever and cholera would become serious menaces to the people who use the water. Generally speaking the water supply of American cities is exceedingly pure. As water and food are the carriers of the germs, it follows that these must be carefully watched should the disease find a lodgement here. It is most fortunate that the cholera bacillus can neither stand heat nor cold. A few days of sharp frost will stamp an epidemic of the disease out. Food must be eaten while hot and fresh from the fire, and water, in cholera times, must be boiled. The extraordinary freedom from cholera which has always marked the Chinese of the southern provinces of the Celestial Empire, living as they do amid almost typical cholera conditions, and with a disregard of sanitation almost sublime, has been credited to the universal habit of tea drinking. In other words, the fact that Chinese never drink water which has not been boiled probably accounts for that other fact that there are any Chinese left to drink anything. While this is putting it strongly, it is not an unpardonable exaggeration.

Should the cholera come here we must then see to it that all germs are destroyed by heat before taking them into our bodies. It is necessary, too, that the most absolute cleanliness, especially of the hands, be observed and particularly for those who handle food. The germs may easily be found on such things as straps in cars, balusters on public stairways, door knobs, money, and the like. I cannot too strongly state the fact that the chances of infection, were the cholera to break out to any extent, would be almost innumerable and that no amount of precaution, therefore, can be too great. A person whose hands in any way come in contact with the discharges of a cholera patient could easily infect hundreds of people by leaving the bacilli where they could attach themselves to other hands. There is another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

danger, and one which is serious, existing in the common house fly. It has been shown that these insects can carry the germs about with them. One reason why food should be eaten hot from the fire in cholera times is because then flies will not light on it and all bacilli on it prior to cooking are killed by the heat.

In case a person is attacked by diarrhœa during a cholera epidemic two dangers are to be avoided. The first is that of a senseless panic; it is by no manner of means certain he has cholera. At the same time we must proceed as though he had in order to avoid the second: that of infection. All discharges must be disinfected at once. For this purpose a solution of seven grains of corrosive sublimate to a pint of water must be kept. It is well to have a large demijohn of this made up and to use it freely. Not only must all the discharges be covered with it, but the patient and any person coming near the infected matter must wash the hands thoroughly in it. In a word, everything in any way exposed must be disinfected. Of course at such a time a physician would be called in at once, and to him must be left the treatment of the case. This article is not designed as a treatise on the treatment of cholera.

So far as the care of the health goes, were cholera to break out, it is not difficult to give directions. Fortunately for us when we are in health we can resist disease germs even if they are taken into the system. The care for ourselves during a cholera outbreak is, therefore, merely that care we should properly take at all times. We must take plenty of sleep, a fair amount of exercise, eat very plain food thoroughly cooked, drink water that has been boiled and allowed to cool in bottles on ice, let raw fruit alone, wear light flannels, and in general lead as rational a life as we may. No precaution against cholera or any other disease equals perfect health, for with this we can defy it.

It is well here to say a word about liquor. Many people believe that brandy, if taken freely enough, will save them from cholera. That brandy has its uses I would be the last to deny, but, assuredly, one of these is not drinking it all the time when there is an epidemic of cholera to the fore. To those who have this idea it is far more dangerous than the disease, and for this reason: The one thing necessary is to keep the health as perfect as possible. Now every one knows that constant drinking weakens the person who drinks and deranges the stomach, and that weakness and disordered digestion invite diseases.

Cholera may be of the mildest possible type, so mild that a person is not confined to the house for more than a day or two, or it may kill within one hour of the attack. It is a disease which cannot be trifled with in any way, and were there an outbreak of it in the city, a physician should be consulted the moment the patient is sick. It is better to make twenty mistakes than to neglect one real case. It is also necessary in cholera time that when a person is attacked with any sickness, especially one accompanied by diarrhœa, that the patient, with the nurse, be quarantined at once. Neither should mingle with the other persons in the house. All cloths, vessels, or anything else from the sick room must be placed in the disinfecting fluid described before being handled by others. No amount of precaution is too great in this regard.

Finally it is well to notify the health officers of the place at once. This notification will in no way injure the patient, while it may be the means of saving the lives of that patient's fellow citizens. To my mind when such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diseases as cholera, typhus, or yellow fever are among us, he who, from a selfish fear of inconveniencing himself, hides the disease from the health authorities is morally guilty of all that may result from his act.

CYRUS EDSON.

LYNCH LAW IN THE SOUTH.

IN THE course of recent events, public attention has been pointedly called to the extent to which the criminal jurisdiction of the courts in the South has been superseded by what is commonly styled Lynch Law. Lynching is prevalent enough in other parts of the Union, but for causes quite obvious when considered, it has lately been more prevalent in the South than elsewhere. Consequently, it is not at all surprising that partisan hostility has availed itself of this fact to again seek to kindle the old expiring fires of sectional misconception and discord.

The effort will not be successful. If lynching is more prevalent in the South than elsewhere, it is because the negro population of the Union is congested in the South mainly, and because, in the last year or so, the negro there has violated the chastity of white women with such appalling frequency, and under circumstances so unutterably shocking to human nature, that the white race there has been goaded into a degree of excited feeling for which no occasion has existed in other parts of the Union. This is why it is that the attitude of the country at large towards lynch law in the South is so tolerant. Nothing can justify lynching, under any conditions not totally abnormal, no matter how heinous the crime, or unmistakably guilty the accused, or orderly the execution, or universal the approbation of the community. But the human heart is passionately wedded to home and the family and to female purity, at once their vital breath and crowning grace.

Of all the crimes that stir the profoundest emotions of the human breast, none are comparable, in this respect, with the grosser crimes against female virtue. In spite of every restraining precept, it is rarely that a jury, in any civilized country of the world, can be found to convict even the husband who has killed the seducer, who has inflicted upon him no injury to which the wife herself was not a voluntary party. What, then, shall we say of the feelings awakened by an outrage surpassing all others in the overwhelming and lasting shame and humilation that it carries along with it?

But the act itself is not all. Suppose the prisoner to be indicted and arraigned.

How ten-fold odious and maddening does the crime become when it recurs in a community almost with the regularity of the morning newspaper! And yet it is no exaggeration to say that such for some time past has been the case in the South. Neither age nor youth has been spared. Between the 29th day of April and the 8th day of June in the present year, outrages by negroes upon white children were reported in the public press from Florida, Virginia, Maryland, Mississippi and Arkansas.

So blindly irrational and overpowering appears to be the criminal impulse, too, that danger of detection and absolute assurance of an awful fate, in case of detection, have but little deterrent force. For instance, a short time since a negro was lynched, in a small village in Virginia, for an assault upon a white woman, and lynched under circumstances calculated to strike terror into every depraved mind. Yet only a brief period afterwards a similar assault was committed in the same village by another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor, it is most painful to record, has one solitary negro of intelligence, so far as the writer knows, ever raised his voice in reprobation of the crime that is responsible for the vast majority of Southern lynchings. Conventions enough of the race have protested against lynch law. One delegation, encouraged, perhaps, by the advice that the President once gave the negro "to people" a southern state, instead of seeking the vacant lands of Oklahoma, has even waited upon the Chief Executive of the nation. But the writer has yet to hear of a single sermon, a single speech, a single paper, in which a negro has expressed the slightest sympathy for the helpless white women who have been abused by his race, in the South, or the slightest detestation of the inhuman creatures who abused them. Indeed, indications are not wanting of a disposition to view the matter solely from a race standpoint. Last fall, a negro on the eastern shore of Maryland, who had been captured by a single white man immediately after attempting an atrocious assault, was actually released from the custody of his captor, and set at large by a band of negroes.

Such are the conditions that have created a widespread feeling on the part of the white race in the South, however mistaken, that the most flagitious of crimes has become almost epidemic in their midst, and that only a nemesis, following the offence as surely and speedily as does the thunder clap the lightning flash, is adequate to the protection of their mothers, wives and daughters. This feeling will hardly be allayed by the advice recently given to the negro by a relict of the carpet-bag era, to resort to the torch and the dagger, though it will certainly receive no accession of irritation from the curious attempt to satisfy the demands of negro delegates, without arousing anew the sympathy of women in other sections of the Union for their suffering Southern sisters, that is apparent in the plank of the late Minneapolis convention, which denounces "the continued inhuman outrages perpetrated on American citizens for *political* reasons in certain States of the Union."

However this may be, there can be no doubt that the pressure of similar conditions, in any State of the Union, outside of the South, would produce exactly the same results. That negro, lately dragged through the streets of Port Jervis, and hanged by a mob of a thousand people, for violating a white woman, and that coroner's jury and that grand jury which were unable to secure a single eye-witness of the hanging, are as strong proofs as could be asked that there is no essential difference between white men in the State of New York and the white men at Nashville who, last April, passed around the watchwords "Remember your homes," "Remember your wives and daughters," and executed their purpose, though one of their number was shot to death, as he should have been, by an officer of the law. There is no little pith in the late remark of the New York *Herald* that, "The difference between bad citizens who believe in lynch law, and good citizens who abhor lynch law, is largely in the fact that the good citizens live where their wives and daughters are perfectly safe."

Why is it that the negro has become such an habitual offender against female virtue in the South? We say nothing of the North; though small, comparatively, as is the negro population of the North, it is addicted to the same crime to a degree altogether out of proportion to its number. We answer unhesitatingly, much as we are gratified that the incubus of slavery has been forever lifted from the South,—because the negro is no longer subject to the authority of a master, and is yet subject to no other form of moral dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipline that can take its place to as good, or better, advantage. Wherever he is brought, as in the cities of the South, into close contact with the white race and its civilization, he has manifested some capacity for the acquisition of education and property. But, in the rural communities of the South, where his race is mainly massed, every year has seen him more and more estranged from all that personal relationship with the white race, authoritative or otherwise, that once exercised such an important influence over him, and, therefore, freer and freer to sucumb to the retrogressive tendencies of his own nature. During the Civil War, and for many years after the war, unsettled as some of these years were, he was rarely known to violate a white woman.

What does the white race in the South intend to do to put an end to lynch law? So far as this result is to be consummated by elevating the negro himself to a higher plane, the white race in the South can only say that it is already doing all that it can do. It has for a long time taxed itself almost beyond its resources to educate the ngro, in the hope that the expansion of his intellectual faculties might make him better fitted to sustain the weight of the exacting privileges that were so abruptly conferred upon him.

The best conscience and intelligence of the South can only promise that they will exhaust every effort to bring the lawless elements of society under control. Anomalous conditions, however, produce anomalous consequences, and unless the negro does his part too, there will doubtless be ample occasion yet for patience. The reassuring thought at every conjuncture should be that, if lynching is the wrongful and dangerous practice that it unquestionably is, the communities where it is practised will be the first to feel its bad effects, and will, therefore, be the wisest and most efficient instruments for its extirpation.

W. CABELL BRUCE.

WOMEN IN THE FIELD OF ART-WORK.

THE art-work of women now past middle life was mostly confined in their early youth to copying with a crayon point the "hatchings" and "stipplings" of French lithographs. Artistic taste was at that time nourished on such subjects as girls with birds in their hands, Italian hurdy-gurdy players, with languid black eyes, under plumed slouch hats. In addition to such sallies, young women employed leisure moments in painfully duplicating with fine lead pencils the innumerable leaves of trees seen in engravings, while some old castle or the round tower of a mill, in the portfolio of their drawing professor, excited great enthusiasm. But then art students were rare and scarcely found outside our large cities and towns. The mothers of the present generation of girls recollect well this state of things, and they can also recall the square cross-stitch done in Berlin wools then usual for embroidering slippers and lamp-mats; while a dog, cat, or lion, executed in the same way, was the theme for a hearth-rug or a fire-screen.

But our grandmothers were even more elementary than their daughters in their conception of art. When the young lady of that generation had finished her sampler in crewel-work, and appended to this bit of embroidery a yellow canary bird eating impossible cherries from a tree scarcely taller than itself; or had fashioned with her needle a willow tree overhanging a white gravestone, above which a mourner was weeping, such examples

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constituted her artistic "finishing," and she was deemed fit to enter society or to assume, often at fifteen or sixteen years of age, the cares of wedded life.

Few people travelled abroad then, and Mr. Ruskin had not shown the part art might play as a means of civilization. Our present purpose is to show the lack of interest in art fifty years ago, when there was little enlightened appreciation of it outside a small circle of enlightened people who were the admirers of such artists as Copley or Allston, and to contrast with this limited acceptance its position in the United States to-day, especially as it affects women.

The large art schools of the country significantly indicate the direction art is taking. Among them the Woman's Art School of the Cooper Union affords a suggestive example; and its sister schools throughout the country tell the same story of the broadened intellectual life of women. When we allude to the schools of Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Washington, and mention the new buildings that have lately been erected for museums and schools in Minneapolis, Cincinnati, and Chicago, and speak of the art departments connected with Harvard or Yale, in which women have equal opportunities with men for study; to say nothing of the studios filled with art collections at such women's colleges as Vassar, Wellesley and Smith, we see how large a field art now occupies; without counting the myriad children now learning to draw in the public schools of the United States.

Genius is the rarest of gifts. But when we look back and see the portraits by Angelica Kaufmann, and the carvings by the daughter of Erwin von Steinbach in Strasburg Cathedral, we recognize that, here and there, among those who follow an intellectual life, there have been women artists of high gifts. But art which touches a whole population is better indicated on a lower plane than that which affects people of genius; and we find thousands of young American women now seeking to embody their ambition in artistic form. One observes in such a school as the Cooper Institute about four hundred persons devoting themselves to artistic study. Recognizing the necessity of thoroughness if they may expect success, the larger portion are learning to draw in black and white from the antique and the life models. The Art Students' League, the Metropolitan Art Schools, and the National Academy contain large classes of women; while in Boston, Philadelphia, and elsewhere the same conditions occur.

Parents of college boys are usually content to give their sons from four to seven years in which to prepare for the business of life. Many women allow themselves four years to study art, and often they take a longer time; but it most frequently happens that they have themselves earned the money to defray the expense of their education, differing in this respect from their more favored brothers.

The practice of any branch of knowledge is tantamount to its continued study. But for the first elements of drawing or of cutting blocks for engraving, or pen-and-ink work for etching and illustrating, a long apprenticeship is first requisite.

We have seen how girls in the last generation found their examples of art in the portfolio of their teacher. Illustrated magazines, which in themselves are now a liberal education, had at that time no existence. Good engravings were then rare, and photography had not been dreamed of. Now, girls can dream over the Sistine Madonna in a photograph which gives nearly the full impression of the original, while an etching from Turner echoes the sentiment of that artist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The paintings of more than two hundred women in a late exhibition of the Royal Academy hung side by side with those of eleven hundred male contributors. Visitors to this English gallery may recall the portraits by Mrs. Jopling, Mrs. Perugini, or Mrs. Stillman as among the best works there. Justice concedes that these English women rank well with men.

Fine paintings are few, compared with the multitude of articles in porcelain, carvings, or ornamental designs, designated as industrial art. One phase of art expresses itself through a small class of engravers, where delicate taste and deft handicraft appear. Here are found the principal compositions of Mrs. Mary Hallock Foote. In these she depicts remote Western life and the arid scenery of the desert where the cactus protrudes above long stretches of sand. Such a landscape forms the setting of rough Mexicans or Indians, varied by the soft-haired women and children of the Eastern States. These illustrations form a chief attraction of some of our most prominent periodicals.

But there is a more frequent type of artistic woman, composed of those without aptitude for untried paths, who are skilful in developing on the the block the "tone," "values," and graces of composition which other artists have originated. It is interesting to observe a young girl at work on a block of wood, five or six inches square, resting on its leather cushion, on which a landscape or group of figures has been photographed. The scene may be by Abbey, Chase, or Gifford. Beside the workwoman is the original drawing. A little three-cornered knife in her deft fingers cuts and touches the wood, but in such tiny lines as often can be seen only through the magnifying glass; while she refers frequently to the original drawing to render a form more correctly.

In Charleston, S. C., one young Southern girl has an office for commercial engraving. Until she returned home from studying in the North, there was no such branch of work as hers along the Southern Atlantic seaboard. In some of the Western States women have formed partnerships and gone into the business of engraving.

Many interiors of dwellings and public buildings show that women decorators have worked successfully. The names of Mrs. Wheeler and Miss Revere Johnson are well known. In the Union League Club of New York and the Seventh Regiment Armory the richly-glowing work of some portions was painted by a woman; while the harmoniously-toned stained glass by a sister artist attests her talent and skill. Magnificently-embroidered curtains, where nets filled with glittering fish that have suffered a sea change into something new and strange, evince the elegant taste of a lady foremost as a decorator.

The rooms of the Associated Artists in New York disclose a charming life. Modern tapestry is wrought here by hands that follow closely the methods of Beauvais or Bayeux; while masses of roses or trailing vines in their luxuriant beauty and the varying forms of nature are copied in floss on satin. Textile fabrics of many sorts appear wrought by fingers that weave a glitter into satin or give a bloom to homely fabrics. This little world has its own intense life, while it is scarcely known outside except by such stately pieces of embroidery as the great curtain of the stage at the Madison Square Theatre. In other directions of beautiful embellishment the art-paper manufacturers have produced some of their best hangings from designs furnished them by women. The silk factories of the Messrs. Cheney owe to our art students patterns for brocades and satins, besides suggestions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for weaving their splendid goods which add to the sheen of satin the diaphanous effect of velvet, or which by various threads and surfaces increase their richness and beauty.

Among new directions of art, pen and ink illustration furnishes a promising field. Newspapers and magazines are filled with many a sketch from the busy brain of a woman, printed from her drawing without the intervention of the engraver's block.

Mediæval illuminators, stonecutters or metal workers, dreamed and wrought with almost religious enthusiasm, and we fancy the sweet serenity in which these toilers for beauty spent their happy days. On us are shed, from time to time, the side-lights of many little groups of persons who in our own day still perpetuate such a remote and ideal experience. Girls and women are heard of who, content to be poor and unknown, are happy and serene in carrying out plans for stained glass or mural ornamentation in the studios of Mr. Lafarge, Mr. Tiffany, Mr. Crowninshield, and other artists who can guide the brain of those who yet furnish many a delicate thought in clever arrangement of form or color.

Among rich American women are found such ladies as Mrs. Maria Longworth Nicholas, now Mrs. Bellamy Storer, who founded the Rockwood potteries at Cincinnati, and herself supported a pottery school. Cincinnati pottery is widely known, and in it the influence of women is clearly discernible. Miss Louise McLaughlin has the credit of re-discovering the Haviland underglaze. She modified this Haviland process with Japanese methods till an attempt was finally made for a distinctive style; and her potteries are now famous for their unusual variety of glazes and clay surfaces.

Cincinnati women have made their mark also as wood carvers. Many a piece of magnificent representation of animal and vegetable forms, as rich as Flemish or Italian carvings, attests the skill and taste of these artists. Women are taking an important part in the art education of children. Such institutions as the Cooper Institute, the Art Students' League and the Boston Normal Art School, furnish multitudes of teachers. Many of these are Supervisors of State drawing schools in our large cities and towns, where often 10,000 children are under the influence of one of these ladies. A young woman has studied with New York artists, themselves pupils of Carolus Duran, Gérôme, or Henner; has graduated at the Art Students' League, or the Cooper Institute, or perhaps has drawn and painted in Paris or Munich; at twenty-five, she goes to Wisconsin, Michigan, or still further West. Here she has a dozen teachers of the public schools to instruct directly, and she supervises drawing-classes over large sections of those States. Far away on the frontier such a teacher gets up painting-classes in her own studio, where she hangs up studies made under Mr. Gifford or Mr. Weir. She starts an Art Club for the circulation of photographs from the great masters, on the same principle as a Book Club. Then small art libraries are formed.

We have not dwelt at all in this article on the oil and water color pictures made by women and seen in our exhibitions. Such work is public, and everyone has a chance to know of many a good portrait or bit of still life. But we have endeavored to throw light into some of the by-ways of Art which are subtly and surely affecting the life of this nation, though to what extent is generally little known.

SUSAN N. CARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED